

**THE EFFECT OF USING SELF-REGULATED STRATEGY  
DEVELOPMENT (SRSD) TO INCREASE THE ABILITY  
IN WRITING NARRATIVE PARAGRAPH OF THE  
SECOND YEAR STUDENTS AT JUNIOR HIGH  
SCHOOL AL-ISHLAH PEKANBARU**



**BY**

**QURNIA IQBAL**

**NIM. 10714000788**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1434 H/2013 M**

**THE EFFECT OF USING SELF-REGULATED STRATEGY  
DEVELOPMENT (SRSD) TO INCREASE THE ABILITY  
IN WRITING NARRATIVE PARAGRAPH OF THE  
SECOND YEAR STUDENTS AT JUNIOR HIGH  
SCHOOL AL-ISHLAH PEKANBARU**

Thesis

Submitted to Fulfill One of the Requirements  
for Undergraduate Degree in English Education  
(S.Pd.)



By

**QURNIA IQBAL**

**NIM. 10714000788**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1434 H/2013 M**

## SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

The thesis entitled “*The Effect of Using Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) to Increase the Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph of the Second Year Students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru*” is written by Qurnia Iqbal, NIM. 10714000788. It has been accepted and approved to be examined in the meeting of the final examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Pekanbaru, Muharram 29<sup>th</sup> 1434 H  
November 30<sup>th</sup> 2012 M

Approved by

The Chairperson of English  
Education Department

Supervisor

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Drs. M. Syafi'i S, M.Pd.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT



First of all, I would like to praise Allah the Almighty for the blessing and mercy given to me during my study and in completing this writing at the Department of English Education, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University (UIN) Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau. *Shalawat* and gratitude do to the best educator that teaches and educates the human kind, he is the prophet Muhammad saw.

I got so much help and support in conducting and finishing this writing. Therefore, I would like to extend great gratitude to many people that have been extensively involved in this writing, they are:

1. Prof. Dr. H. M. Nazir, the Rector of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
2. Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag, the Dean of Education and Teacher Training Faculty and all staff.
3. Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd, the Chairperson of English Education Department
4. Dedy Wahyudi, M.Pd, the Secretary of English Education Department of UIN Suska Riau.
5. Dra. Hj. Yusrida, M.Pd, my academic adviser, thanks for your valuable guidance, advices as well as encouragement in accomplishing this writing. And also all lecturers who have taught me through the meeting both in the class and out of the class.
6. Drs. M. Syafi'i S, M.Pd, my supervisor, thanks for the support, advice, suggestion, correction, and guidance in completing and finishing this writing.
7. Jonri Kasdi, S.Pd and Kurnia Budiyaniti, M.Pd, the raters.
8. Ir. Andi M Amir, S.Pd and Zuriati, S.Pd.I, The Headmaster and the English teacher of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

9. My beloved father and mother. I do not know what to say, I love you Mom, Dad. You are my everything.
10. My beloved brothers, Rahmat Hidayat and M. Tamil Ruhama, and all my family connection.
11. All member of PBI 2007, special for Farikhan, Liza, Fitri, Seri, Nana, Henny, Yogi, Fina, Mina, Ilis, Ayla, and Rohana. Also to my friends: Ardi, Eky, Nopri, Adiv, Hasbi, Arizon, Wazri, Supardi, Alam, Anas, Debi, Sihor, Fandi, Untung, Moza, Nardi, Jupri, Midi, Arif, Fajri, Taufik, Amy, Izet, Echa, Molly, Ilsa, Ita, Hasyim, Probo and Firman. And I do not forget to extend my gratitude to you all who might not be mentioned individually here for the great support in conducting and finishing this writing.

Finally, I really realizes that there are many weaknesses on this writing. Therefore, constructive critiques and suggestion are needed in order to improve this writing.

May Allah Almighty, the Lord of universe bless all of us. Amin.

Pekanbaru, February 19<sup>th</sup> 2013

The writer

Qurnia Iqbal  
NIM. 10714000788

## ABSTRACT

**Qurnia Iqbal (2013) : The Effect of Using Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) to Increase the Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph of the Second Year Students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru**

This research conducted is due to the fact that many students of Junior High School Al- Ishlah Pekanbaru think that writing is one of the language skills that are difficult to be mastered. This research is an experimental research which uses quasi-experimental design with the main objective of determining whether or not there is a significant difference between using and without using SRSD to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

It used 44 participants out of 64 students divided into two classes. They are VIII 3 as experimental class and VIII 1 as control class. The experiment class was taught by using SRSD while control class was taught by using conventional way, it was Presentation method. The writer used tests in this research, namely pre-test and post-test. the tests was used to take the data of students' ability in writing narrative paragraph. Then the data are measured by using ESL Composition Profile. In analyzing the data, the writer used t-test.

Having analyzed it by using t-test, the average value of the result of post-test was much higher than the result of pre-test. It was the value of  $t_{\text{observed}}$  which was higher than  $t_{\text{table}}$  both in significance level of 5% and 1%, it was  $2.02 < 2.93 > 2.72$ . This means that  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_o$  is rejected. In other words, there is a significant difference between using and without using Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph. In conclusion, teaching narrative paragraph by using SRSD is better than teaching narrative by using conventional technique at the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>SUPERVISOR APPROVAL</b> .....  | i   |
| <b>EXAMINER APPROVAL</b> .....  | ii  |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....  | iii |
| <b>DEDICATION</b> .....   | v   |
| <b>ABSTRACT</b> .....   | vi  |
| <b>LIST OF CONTENTS</b> .....   | ix  |
| <b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....   | x   |
| <b>LIST OF APPENDIXES</b> .....   | xii |
| <b>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION</b>   |     |
| A. Background of the Problem .....  | 1   |
| B. The Definition of the Terms .....  | 7   |
| C. The Problem .....  | 9   |
| D. The Objective and the Significance of the Research .....   | 10  |
| <b>CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE</b>  |     |
| A. Theoretical of Framework .....   | 12  |
| B. Relevant Research .....  | 43  |
| C. Operational Concept .....  | 45  |
| D. Assumption and Hypothesis .....  | 47  |
| <b>CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>   |     |
| A. The Research Design .....  | 48  |
| B. The Time and Location of the Research .....  | 49  |
| C. The Subject and the Object of the Research .....   | 49  |
| D. The Population and the Sample .....  | 49  |
| E. The Technique of Data Collection .....   | 50  |
| F. The Techniques of the Data Analysis .....  | 52  |
| <b>CHAPTER IV DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS</b>   |     |
| A. The Description of the Research Variable .....   | 58  |
| B. The Data Presentation .....  | 58  |
| C. The Data Presentation of Using SRSD toward the<br>Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph ..... | 71  |
| D. The Data Analysis .....  | 72  |
| <b>CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION</b>  |     |
| A. Conclusion .....   | 77  |
| B. Suggestion .....   | 77  |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....   | 79  |
| <b>APPENDIXES</b>   |     |

## LIST OF TABLES

### CHAPTER III

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table III. 1. The Research Design .....                          | 48 |
| Table III. 2. The Population and the Sample of the Research..... | 50 |
| Table III. 3. The Blueprint of the Test .....                    | 51 |
| Table III. 4. The Blueprint of Treatment.....                    | 52 |
| Table III. 5. The ESL Composition Profile.....                   | 53 |
| Table III. 6. The Specification of the Test .....                | 56 |
| Table III. 7. The Classification of Students' Score .....        | 57 |

### CHAPTER IV

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table IV. 1. The Score of the Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph by Using SRSD.....                   | 59 |
| Table IV. 2. The Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class.....                               | 60 |
| Table IV. 3. The Mean and the Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class.....               | 60 |
| Table IV. 4. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Content of Writing.....               | 61 |
| Table IV. 5. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Organization of Writing.....          | 61 |
| Table IV. 6. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Vocabulary of Writing.....            | 62 |
| Table IV. 7. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Language Use of Writing .....         | 63 |
| Table IV. 8. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Mechanics of Writing .....            | 64 |
| Table IV. 9. The Score of the Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph by Using Conventional Technique..... | 65 |
| Table IV. 10. The Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class.....                                   | 66 |



|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table IV. 11. The Mean and the Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class .....            | 66 |
| Table IV. 12. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Content of Writing.....        | 67 |
| Table IV. 13. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Organization of Writing.....   | 67 |
| Table IV. 14. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Vocabulary of Writing.....     | 68 |
| Table IV. 15. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Language Use of Writing .....  | 69 |
| Table IV. 16. The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test on Mechanics of Writing .....     | 70 |
| Table IV. 17. The Recapitulation of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test .....                                | 71 |
| Table IV. 18. The Percentage of the Students' Writing from Pre-test to Post-test.....                         | 73 |
| Table IV. 19. The Mean and the Standard Deviation of the Scores for Experimental Class and Control Class..... | 74 |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Background of the Problem

Teaching English in Indonesia is focused on the students' ability to use the language in real situation. Dealing with this, Alexander in Kalayo Hasibuan states that the mastery of language is not ultimately measured from how much learners know about language (usage), but how well they can use it for various purposes in real context.<sup>1</sup> The context can be in oral and or written forms. The students should be able to learn the four language skills, namely: listening, speaking, reading and writing. The students should have the abilities in reading and listening to support their speaking and writing, and so forth.

As one of the four language skills, writing has always occupied place in most English language courses. One of the reasons is that more and more people need to learn to write in English for occupational or academic purposes. English department students, especially, need to learn writing and prepare themselves for the final academic assignment, thesis writing. This, in terms of student's needs, integrated writing is necessary.

To write well, people must have good capabilities in writing. Moreover, someone who wants to write a paragraph or a story must know the steps in writing process and aspects of writing itself. According to Richards, et al, paragraph is a unit of organization of written language, which serves to

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Kalayo Hasibuan and M. Fauzan Ansyari, *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)* (Pekanbaru, UNRI Press, 2007), p. 1

indicate how the main ideas in a written text are grouped.<sup>2</sup> The writer must be able to organize the ideas to construct the sentences, to use punctuation and spelling well. Besides, they must be able to arrange the writing into cohesive and coherent paragraphs and texts. In short, writer should focus on content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.<sup>3</sup> So it can be stated that writing is not a simple subject, when we want to write something, we should demonstrate our English grammatical competence and also knowledge skill in writing.

Strategy is needed in teaching-learning process, especially in teaching writing. Since writing takes time, energy, and it is a long process, the students usually get difficulties in starting their writing. That will cause many students waste valuable time just for getting started. So it needs appropriate strategies in teaching writing in order to produce good writing.

Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru applies School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) in the process of teaching and learning. Kelly states that educational curriculum is a set of plan and systematization about purposes, content, learning material, and the way that used as the guide in conducting the learning process to reach the specific goal of education.<sup>4</sup> Curriculum refers to the total of content to be taught and goals to be realized within one school or educational system, especially for English subject, below are the purposes

---

<sup>2</sup> Jack C. Richards *et al.*, *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (London, Pearson Education limited, 1992), p. 262

<sup>3</sup> M. Syafi'i S, *The Effective Paragraph Development: The Process of Writing for Classroom Setting* (Pekanbaru, LBSI, 2007), pp. 139-153

<sup>4</sup> A.V. Kelly, *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice*, (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) (London, SAGE Publications 2004), pp. 2-11 (Retrieved on December 20th 2012 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

and the scope of English teaching in Junior high school.

There are three main purposes of English teaching in Junior high school based on KTSP, they are: 1) developing communicative competence in spoken and written language to reach functional literacy; 2) generating awareness about the nature and importance of English to improve nation's competitiveness in global society; 3) developing student's understanding about the relationship between language and culture.

The scope of English language teaching in junior high school are ; 1) discourse competence or ability to understand and/ or produce spoken text and/ or written text which is integrated comprehensively in four skills, such as listening, speaking, reading and writing to reach functional literacy level. 2) the ability to understand and create various short functional texts, monologues, as well essay in a form of procedure, descriptive, recount, narrative and report. Variation in teaching materials are found in the use of certain vocabulary, grammar and rhetoric devices. 3) supporting competence included are; linguistic competence (ability to use grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing arrangement), socio-cultural competence (ability to use speech and language act appropriately in various context of communication), strategic competence (ability to overcome problems in communication to ensure the progress of communication), and discourse competence (ability to use discourse instrument).<sup>5</sup>

English is taught twice a week at Junior High School Al-Ishlah

---

<sup>5</sup> SMP Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru, *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* (Pekanbaru, SMP Al-Ishlah, 2010), p. 18

Pekanbaru, with duration of 40 minutes for one-hour meeting. As stated in KTSP, English is taught for four competencies or basic skills, they are reading, listening, speaking, and writing there. Especially in writing, this curriculum states that junior high school students learn some kinds of texts in English such as narrative, descriptive, recount, procedure and report.

Principally, narrative is a message that tells or presents a story. A story is an account of an event or a series of events, both natural and non-natural, either true or fictitious; an anecdote; a report or an allegation of facts. When we tell a story that has happened in the past, logically, the grammatical feature that mainly we use will be past tense. But, the generic structure using past is a kind of guidelines or outlines in writing narratives. So, we can use present tense in narratives.

Narrative is taught to the second year students of junior high school Al-Ishlah in the second semester. The goal of teaching narrative is the students are expected to be able to write a simple narrative text in correct rhetorical steps. The competence standard of teaching writing is expressing ideas in functional and simple written text in the form of recount and narrative to interact in the surroundings. And in the basic competence, it is stated that the function of teaching writing is to express ideas and rhetorical steps in simple written recount and narrative accurately, fluently and acceptable to interact in the surroundings. And the KKM or minimal achievement standard for English subject at Junior High School Al- Ishlah Pekanbaru is 70.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35

Based on the information gained from English teacher of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru, the students are demanded to pass all courses with the satisfactory score, as stated before, it is 70. English, especially writing has been taught maximally there. The teacher showed some examples of a text at first, explained the purposes, grammatical features, generic structure, and everything related to the text, then the teacher provided some interesting topics for the students, such as celebration around the world, once upon a time, a friend in need is a friend indeed, all of which relate to narrative. After doing these, the teacher asked them to produce a narrative paragraph based on the explanation. Besides, some techniques also have been applied in the process of teaching and learning there to improve the students ability in writing, such as drafting, using chart, etc.

Based on the description, English has been taught maximally at junior high school Al- Ishlah Pekanbaru. Ideally, the students already have a good ability in writing, but in fact, many of the students are still have problems in narrative writing. It can be seen from the symptoms below:

1. Some of the students fail in developing background knowledge of a narrative topic
2. Some of the students have difficulties to use suitable tenses in writing narrative paragraph
3. Most of the students do not have appropriate strategy in writing a narrative paragraph
4. Most of the students cannot state their ideas and develop them into a good narrative paragraph

Based on the symptoms above, it can be clearly seen that writing ability of the students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru has to be improved. It needs a special effort to increase their ability in producing a writing. Theoretically, there are some strategies in teaching to increase the students' writing ability, one of them is Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD). Karin Sandmel *et al.* say, with SRSD, students are explicitly and systematically taught writing strategies, self-regulation procedures, and relevant metacognitive knowledge, and are provided with meaningful opportunities to support their development.<sup>7</sup> These all are important parts to make them understand and appreciate the importance of what they are learning, in this case, it is the development of ability in writing. SRSD instruction is scaffolded, like someone learns to ride a bicycle for the first time. He or she will need additional wheels at the back of the bicycle, so do SRSD that the responsibility for applying and recruiting the writing strategies, knowledge, skills, and self-regulation procedures gradually shifts from the teacher to the students. Throughout the process of teaching and learning, students actively collaborate with the teacher and each other, and the role of students' effort is emphasized and rewarded. With SRSD, the focus and process of instruction are individualized based on the students' unique needs and capabilities. It shows that it is criterion-based

---

<sup>7</sup> Karin Sandmel *et al.*, *Success and Failure with Tier-2 SRSD for Timed-Writing Tests among Second through Fifth-Grade Students with Writing and Behavioral Difficulties Implications for Evidence-Based Practice, Advances in Learning and Behavioral Disabilities Volume 24, Assessment and Intervention*, ed. Thomas E. Scruggs and Margo A. Mastropieri (Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 254 (Retrieved on December 20<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

rather than time-based. Instruction is further differentiated by adjusting goals, feedback, and instructional support in response to students' current levels of performance and rates of progress. Moreover, SRSD instruction is criterion-based rather than time-based; it needs a lot of time to meet the criterion because the students move through the instructional process at their own pace. In conclusion, SRSD is an ongoing process in which new strategies are introduced and previously taught strategies are upgraded over time based on the situation, condition, and their needs.

Based on the background and the symptoms above, the writer is interested in raising this matter into a study entitled: The Effect of Using Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) to Increase the Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph of the Second Year Students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

## **B. The Definition of the Terms**

The following are the definition of terms related to this research that will hopefully clarify for better comprehension to avoid misinterpretation and misunderstanding.

### **1. SRSD**

Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) is an instructional strategy in the process of teaching and learning designed to improve a writer's strategic behavior, knowledge and motivation. It is a research-based strategy first implemented by Steve Graham and Karen Harris out of the University of Maryland. It was used for the students with learning



disabilities, but recently it also used for normal students. According to Reid and Lienemann, it has been used for improving spelling, math, reading, and writing,<sup>8</sup> but for the purpose of this research, the focus that will be investigated is the area of writing in particular writing narrative paragraph. In this research, SRSD is the strategy used to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

## 2. Ability in Writing

Ability in writing is the ability of a person to express his or her ideas, feeling or something in his or her minds in the form of writing. Maria says that it is a skill which obliges the students to be even more aware of the potential of language because it can exist on its own, and because it may contribute to logical organization.<sup>9</sup> In the context of this research, ability in writing means the students' capacity in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

---

<sup>8</sup> Robert Reid and Torri Ortiz Lienemann, *Strategy Instruction for Students with Learning Disabilities, What Works for Special-Needs Learners*, ed. Karen R. Haris and Steve Graham (New York, The Guilford Press, 2006), p. 32 (Retrieved on October 1<sup>st</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

<sup>9</sup> Maria Da Graca L.C. Pinto, *Looking at Reading and Writing Through Language, Effective Learning and Teaching of Writing: A Handbook of Writing in Education*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), Vol 14. Gert Rijlaarsdam, *et al.* (Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2005), p. 45

## **C. The Problem**

### **1. Identification of the Problem**

Based on the background, it is clear that most of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru get difficulties in writing, especially in writing narrative paragraph. Some of the students fail in developing background knowledge of a narrative topic. Some of the students also have difficulties to use suitable tenses in writing narrative paragraph. Beside that, most of the students do not have appropriate strategy in writing a narrative paragraph and they cannot state their ideas and develop it into a good narrative paragraph.

### **2. Limitation of the Problem**

The writer only focuses on narrative paragraph in this research. Based on the identification of the problems stated above, the problems of this research are limited to the students' failure in developing background knowledge of a narrative topic, the students' difficulties to use suitable tenses in writing narrative paragraph, the students' appropriate strategy in writing a narrative paragraph, and the students' failure to state their ideas and develop them into a good narrative paragraph

### **3. Formulation of the Problem**

Based on the problems above, the main problem of this research is formulated in the following research questions:

- a. How is the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph taught by using SRSD at the second year students of Junior High School Al-

Ishlah Pekanbaru?

- b. How is the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph taught without using SRSD at the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru?
- c. Is there any significant difference between using and without using SRSD to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph at the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru?

#### **D. The Objective and the Significance of the Research**

##### **1. The Objective of the Research**

The object of this research is SRSD to know the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph. The following are the aspects that will be investigated.

- a. To find out the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph taught by using SRSD
- b. To find out the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph taught without using SRSD
- c. To find out the difference between using and without using SRSD to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

## **2. The Significance of the Research**

This research is directed to provide some information that SRSD is one of the effective teaching strategies in English class, especially for teaching writing and give a bit of contributions to the students in the process of writing narrative paragraph. This research is also intended to improve the writer's knowledge in term of strategy applied in teaching writing. Besides, it is conducted to Fulfill one of the requirements to finish writer's study in State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

#### A. Theoretical of Framework

##### 1. The Nature of Writing

###### a. Definition

As one of the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) writing should be gotten attention by linguistics. The experts have discussed writing and they have their own perception on it. Some of theorists give different meaning of writing. Hughey said that writing is a communicative act which depends upon an awareness of social relationship and social expectation.<sup>1</sup> Boardman states that writing is a continuous process of thinking and organizing, rethinking, and reorganizing.<sup>2</sup> Beside, Nunan said that writing can be defined by a series of contrasts:<sup>3</sup>

- 1) It is both a physical and a mental act. Writing as physical act means that the writer commits words or ideas to some medium, whether it is hieroglyphics inked onto parchment or an email message typed into a computer. On the other hand, writing as mental work means that a writer invents ideas,

---

<sup>1</sup> Jane B. Hughey, *et al.*, *Teaching ESL Composition: Principles and Techniques* (Rowley, Massachusetts, Newbury House Publishers Inc, 1983), p. 94

<sup>2</sup> Cynthia. A Boardman, *Writing to Communicate (Paragraph and Essay)* (New York, Longman, 2002), p. 11

<sup>3</sup> David Nunan, *Practical English Language Teaching* (New York, The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. 2003), p. 88

thinking about how to express them, and organizing them into statements and paragraphs that will be clear and understandable to a reader.

- 2) Its purpose is to express and impress. Express means that writers have their desires to show an idea or feeling in certain ways. Absolutely the ideas or feeling expressed by the writers must impress the readers very much. A good writer is a writer who can express his ideas or feeling excellently and impress his readers very much.
- 3) It is both a process and a product. The process here means a writer will follow some steps, namely: imagines, organizes, drafts, edits, reads, and rereads. Ultimately, what the readers see is a product of writing, such as an essay, letter, short story, novel, or research report.

In relation to those definition, writing can be considered as a highly complex process because it involves process of having ideas to express and having knowledge in expressing them. Although writing is perceived as a difficult skill, like other skills, it can be learned. Students are able to enhance their skill by experiencing, practicing, and learning to express their idea. By those processes students will be able to produce a good form of text.

In summary, writing is a process of physical and mental work that finally produces a product of writing that expresses the ideas or

feeling of the writers. It provides a way of expressing ideas, experiences, and feeling to communicate one another through written language. Writing is not mastered naturally that is why the learner should learn and practice it deliberately in order to master it.

#### b. The Component of Writing

Furthermore, there are some components that are necessary for good writing. Hughey states that there are five aspects that must be fulfilled to produce a good writing, they are:<sup>4</sup>

##### 1) Grammar

Grammar has an important role in writing. A good writer usually has a group of grammatical element. The writer can produce the correct sentences in writing paragraphs by mastering the grammar. It is very important for the students to master the grammar of English in order to be able in constructing correct sentences as a basic to be successful in writing.

##### 2) Vocabulary

Vocabulary can be defined as a collection of words that is arranged alphabetically for reference, defined or explained. To enrich the vocabulary is very important in writing. Students cannot express anything in written form without it. Students can explore more deeply what they want to express by mastering vocabulary, because they can select the words that are suitable to the topic of writing.

---

<sup>4</sup> Jane B. Hughey, *et al.*, *Loc. Cit.*

### 3) Mechanics

Spelling, punctuation, and capitalization are included in mechanics. Spelling is important because it is the aspect that can make meaningful writing. A misspelling always makes a confusion of meaning. The meaning will be changed if a word is misspelled and the whole meaning of writing may be touched by a change.

Punctuation also plays an important role in helping readers to establish intonation. Punctuation gives signals to the readers to raise his voice or drop his speed and whether or not the writer wants to stop. If the writer missed putting punctuation mark, the meaning will change.

### 4) Form/Organization

In the organization of writing, a writer should arrange the sentences starting at the details that are near and then moving further, according to plot, where the object is located, and other things which are related to the topic.

### 5) Fluency

A paragraph is said to have coherence or fluency when its sentences are together or flow into each other. In order to have coherence in writing, the movement from one sentence to the other must be logical and smooth. There are two main ways to achieve coherence. The first way is using transition signals to show one idea which is related to the text. The second way to achieve coherence is by arranging the sentence in logical order.



based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that generally the components of writing are generally classified into grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, form/organization, and fluency. Each of them cannot be separated to form a good writing. They must be integrated as a whole.

c. The Step of Writing

Meyers states that there are six steps to make a good writing:<sup>5</sup>

1) Exploring Ideas

Writing first involves discovering ideas. Before writing, let our mind explore freely. And then record those thoughts by writing on whatever you can. As in speaking, you must have something to say, a reason for saying it, and someone to say it to.

a) Your Subject

Before writing ask your self, “what is the subject or the material want to write about and what do I know about it ?” Choose a subject that you care about and know about (or can find out about). Then you will have something interesting to say, and you will say it more clearly and confidently. You must select and then narrow your subject from the general you will practice doing that in the exercise that follows.

---

<sup>5</sup> Allan Meyers, *Gateways to Academic Writing: Effective Sentences Paragraph and Essay* (New York, Longman, 2005), pp. 3-12

b) Your Purpose

After deciding the subject, now ask yourself, “what is the purpose?” Communicating always has a purpose : to persuade, or to entertain or may be to do all three. You could inform, persuade or to entertain your classmate with example of odd incidents you have experienced at your job.

c) Your Audience

After deciding your subject and your purpose, ask yourself, “who is the audience?” To answer to that question will determine what you say about your subject and what the purpose you hope to achieve. You may need to provide a lot of evidence to persuade a reader who does not agree with your opinion, but provide far less for someone who tends to agree with you.

2) Pre Writing

The second step of the writing process involves writing your thoughts on paper or on the computer. Don’t worry about making mistakes because you will probably change your mind and your wording later anyway. This step is called pre writing. It is a time to relax, to write quickly and to begin organizing your thoughts.

a) Brainstorming. One way to capture your thought is by brainstorming, or listing thoughts as they come to you. You

might brainstorm a second or third time to generate more ideas.

- b) Clustering. In clustering, you write your subject in the middle of the page and then circle it. You write related ideas around the circle as they occur to you. Then you circle the ideas and connect them to your subject circle. These related ideas are like branches.
- c) Free Writing. Another way to get started is free writing. You simply write about the subject without worrying about sentence, structure, spelling, logic and grammar. Writing as you would speak so that you can get your ideas down fast.

### 3) Organizing

After you have put your ideas into words, you can begin to organize them. This process involves selecting, subtracting, and adding. Think again about your purpose and audience what goal does you want to accomplish – to inform, persuade, or entertain? What point do you want to make? And what should you tell your readers so that you can accomplish those goals? Return to your pre writing and do the following :

- a) Underline or highlight best ideas in your brainstorming list, putting related ideas together. Add to the as more ideas occur to you and remove or ignore the parts that are not related to your choices.
- b) Choose the part of the clustering diagram that has the best

ideas. Do a second clustering diagram that explores those ideas in greater detail . Ignore the parts of the original diagram that are not related to your choice.

- c) Circle or highlight the best parts of your free writing. Do a second even a third free writing on them, Ignore the parts of each free writings that are not related to your choice. And focus more specifically on your subject and add more details.
- d) Outlining. After selecting, subtracting and adding, the writer can make an informal outline.

#### 4) Writing the First Draft

You have done some pre writing, selected your best ideas, expanded on them, and arranged them in some reasonable order. Now you can begin the first draft of your paragraph. Don't worry about being perfect, so write fast as if you were speaking to your readers. Some steps for drafting can be stated as follows :

- a) Say something about before you write in
- b) Write fast by hand or by computer
- c) Use only one side of the paper
- d) Leave wide margins and double space to make room for changes.
- e) Save your work every five or ten minutes on the computer.

## 5) Revising the Draft

Revising is among the most important steps in writing, especially for people who write in a second language. Revising means improving what you have already written. When you revise, you examine how well your first draft makes its point and achieves its purpose for its audience. That may require rearranging ideas, developing ideas further, cutting out ideas that do not support your point, and changing the wording of your sentences. These are some tips for revising :

- a) Make notes in the margins or write new material on separate sheet of paper.
- b) Circle words you think you misspelled or will want to change later
- c) Tape or staple additions where you want them to go.
- d) On the computer, use cut and paste or insert commands to move things around.
- e) Print out a double space copy for revisions : slow down and revise in pencil.

## 6) Producing the Final Copy

There are two steps in producing the final copy, they are :

- a) Editing

After you have revised your paragraph, you can edit your work. Check it carefully. Focus on grammar, words

choice, verb forms, punctuation, and spelling. Read the paper more than once. Copy it over or print it out again with all your corrections. This draft should be neat and should represent your best effort.

b) Proofreading

The final stage in the revision process is proofreading.

That means carefully reading your draft more than once to check that your revisions and editorial changes were made correctly.

In addition, Syafi'i states that there are three stages of writing, they are:<sup>6</sup>

- 1) Prewriting. It is viewed as thinking before writing, because to reach a qualified writing of course it needs an adequate preparation. Prewriting consists of:
  - a) Choosing and narrowing a topic. The topic should be interesting and knowledgeable.
  - b) Brainstorming. It is the activity of collecting and generating the material of writing through listing, free writing, and clustering.
- 2) Planning, the stages of organizing the brainstorming
  - a) Brainstorming by listing
  - b) Grouping
  - c) Writing the topic sentences
  - d) Simple outlining

---

<sup>6</sup> M. Syafi'i S, *The Effective Paragraph Development: The Process of Writing for Classroom Setting* (Pekanbaru, LBSI, 2007), pp. 113-138

### 3) Writing and revising drafts

- a) Writing the first rough draft based on the outline.
- b) Revising content and organization
- c) Proofreading the second draft for grammatical and mechanical errors
- d) Writing the final copy, the product of your writing.

It can be seen that generally the steps of writing consists of pre-writing, writing process, and post writing. By the writer, pre-writing is often called as an invention stage. It includes the preliminary things that the writer do to get started writing. Before writing, someone needs to determine what to write and should have something meaningful to convey. If he or she has determined what he will write about, he or she usually needs an incubation period in which to full it over, organizes his or her thinking and perhaps generates more ideas or collects more information. By doing this, finally the writer would not get confused about the ideas, he will presented in his writing because he has already focused on selected the topic. In short, it can be said that pre-writing stage is a stage of warming up of discovering what you know and what you need to know.

The second stage is the process of discovering ordering principles so that the ideas can be organized in such a way as to make them understandable and believable to the readers. In this stage the writer should decide the way he will present the idea, as same as what

it has explained in the previous discussion, that it is important for the writer to be familiar with the characters of the readers. So he can find he appropriate style in presenting his writing.

The last stage of writing is post-writing, it involves writing all draft and the final product, including several addition materials before the writer comes to the final product. Post-writing means polishing the final product by proof reading and making connection in grammar, mechanics and spelling. In this stage, the writer may add several ideas that the writer thinks necessary for his writing, revising, and editing his compositions. The important thing that the writer should be done in this stage is making connection in grammar, mechanics and spelling. The writer will be surer that his writing is completely understood both content and organization.

## **2. The Nature of Narrative**

### **a. Definition of Narrative**

Related to explanation above, the writer has to discuss narrative to support the theories. Narrative has many definitions, but simply, it tella a story. Artono states that narrative is an imaginative story to entertain people.<sup>7</sup> Keraf also states about the definition that narrative is a story tells or describes an action in the past time clearly.<sup>8</sup> In addition, Kane says that a narrative is a meaningful sequence of events told in

---

<sup>7</sup> Artono Wardiman, *et. al.*, *English in Focus for Grade VIII Junior High School (SMP/MTs)* (Jakarta, Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2008), p. 93 (Retrieved on December 11<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

<sup>8</sup> Gorys Keraf, *Argumentasi dan Narasi* (Jakarta, PT. Gramedia, 2001), p. 136



words.<sup>9</sup> Sequence always involves an arrangement in time.

It is important to know the essential purpose of the narrative text, it is to inform and entertain. Narrative text will tell the story with amusing way. It provides an esthetic literary experience to the reader. Narrative text is written based on life experience. In literary term, experience is what we do, feel, hear, read, even what we dream. For example, the purpose of a myth is often to explain a natural phenomenon and a legend is often intended to pass on cultural traditions or beliefs.

A narrative is organized focusing on character oriented. It is built by using descriptive familiar language and dialogue. There are some genres of literary text which fit to be classified as the narrative text. Some of them are:

- 1) Folktales, it includes fables, legend, myth, or realistic tales
- 2) Mysteries, fantasy, science or realistic fiction

Commonly, narrative text is organized by the story of grammar. It will be beginning, middle and end of the story. To build this story grammar, a narrative text needs plot. This plot will determine the quality of the story. Plot is a series of episodes which holds the reader' attention while they are reading the story.

Conflict is the main important element of the plot. This conflict among the characters will drive the story progress. In this conflict,

---

<sup>9</sup> Thomas S. Kane, *The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing* (New York, Barkley Books, 2000), p. 363 (Retrieved on January 8<sup>th</sup> 2012 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

readers will be shown how the characters face the problem and how they have ability to handle that problem.

So, it can be stated that narrative is some kind of retelling, often in words of something that happened. The narrative is not the story itself but rather the telling of the story. While a story just is a sequence of events, a narrative recounts those events, perhaps leaving some occurrences out because they are from some perspective insignificant, and perhaps emphasizing others. In a series of events, a car crash takes a split second. A narrative account, however, might be almost entirely about the crash itself and the few seconds leading up to it. Narratives thus shape history (the series of events, the story of what happened).

#### b. The Generic Structures

Knapp and Watkins states that the generic structures of narratives consists of Orientation, sequence of events and Resolution.<sup>10</sup>

*Orientation:* It sets the scene and introduces the participants/characters.

*Complication:* It explores the conflict in the story. It will show the crisis, rising crisis and climax of the story.

*Resolution:* It shows the situation which the problems have been resolved. It must be our note that “resolved” means accomplished whether succeed or fail.

It can be concluded from the explanation that generally the generic structure of narrative consists of three stages; they are

---

<sup>10</sup> Peter Knapp and Megan Watkins, *Genre ,Text, Grammar, Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing* (Sydney, University of New South Wales Press, 2005), pp. 224-226 (Retrieved on January 14<sup>th</sup> 2012 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

Orientation, Complication, and Resolution. The must be integrated as a whole in order to produce a complete story.

c. Language features

Language features vary in different narrative genres. Here are the common features:

- 1) It is presented in spoken or written form;
- 2) It may be augmented/ supplemented/ partly presented using images (such as illustrations) or interactive/multimedia elements (such as hypertext/ images/ video/ audio);
- 3) It is told/ written in first or third person (I, we, she, it, they);
- 4) It is told/ written in past tense<sup>11</sup> (sometimes in present tense);
- 5) It has chronological (plot or content has a chronology of events that happened in a particular order);
- 6) The main participants are characters with recognizable qualities, often stereotypical and contrasting (hero/ villain);
- 7) Typical characters, settings and events are used in each genre;
- 8) The connectives are widely used to move the narrative along and to affect the reader/listener:
- 9) to signal time (later that day, once);
- 10) to move the setting (meanwhile back at the cave, on the other side of the forest);
- 11) To surprise or create suspense (suddenly, without warning).

---

<sup>11</sup> Artono Wardiman, *et al.*, *Op. Cit.*, p. 102

As stated before, the language features may vary in different narrative genres. The above are the common one. Sometimes it could be used or omitted, depends on needs, aim, situation, and condition of writing narrative. Still, some of important features could not be omitted, such as it is told/ written in past tense, its plot, it is told/ written in first or third person, never in second person, typical characters, settings and events.

### **3. Students' Writing Ability**

Writing is important as a means of communication and discovery. In each field of life, there must be different need of communication through writing. For example, student writes project paper, takes test and makes reports. The job applicant writes letter and resume to the foreign company. The business person writes reports and instructions for their foreigner partners. The costumer writes complaint about the faulty product ordered of foreign company. Based on the fact above, it is important to know how to compose and communicate information and ideas in written English as Holladay and Brown said that the success of our written communications depends largely upon our skill in composition.<sup>12</sup>

Writing ability is the ability of a person to express his or her ideas, feeling, or something in his or her minds in the form of writing. Many students see writing only as a classroom exercise, something done to satisfy the English teacher and then to be tossed aside. Truly, writing is not

---

<sup>12</sup> Sylvia A. Holladay and Thomas L Brown, *Options in Rhetoric Writing and Reading* (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Inc, 1981), p. 2

only as a classroom exercise, it is an essential life time skill – a skill which, because of its multiple uses and functions, will enable them to continually expand their personal horizons. Student-writers need to recognize that mastering the complexities of writing process not only will help them attain their immediate goal – well written essay, reports, and research paper – but will also serve them for beyond the confines of the English classroom. In conclusion, the ability to write a good paragraph or composition is one of the students' skills that have to be mastered.

Based on the curriculum of KTSP, there are some texts needed to be mastered by the students of junior high school, they are:

- a. Recount is a text which retells events or experiences in the past.
- b. Narrative (focus of this research) is a text to entertain the reader with a story that deals with complication or problematic events which lead to a crisis and in turn finds a resolution.<sup>13</sup>
- c. Procedure is a text that explains a method of making or doing something.
- d. Descriptive is a text which lists the characteristics of someone or something.
- e. Report text is a text type we use when we want to describe the way things are such as a man-made thing, animals, and plants. It delivers information about something naturally, as a result of observations, systematically or analysis. It also provides and organizes factual information on a specific topic.

---

<sup>13</sup>Yusak Muchlas, *A Brief Introduction to Genre* (Jawa Tengah, LPMP, 2004), p.46

Descriptive and procedure are kinds of text that should be mastered by the first year student of junior high school. For second year students, the kinds of text that should be mastered are descriptive, recount, and narrative. And for the third year, student should master the genre of procedure, report, and narrative.

Further, it is stated in the syllabus of English subject for the second year students of SMP Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru that the the goal of teaching narrative is the students are expected to be able to write a simple narrative text in correct rhetorical steps. The competence standard of teaching writing is expressing ideas in functional and simple written text in the form of recount and narrative to interact in the surroundings. And in the basic competence, it is stated that the function of teaching writing is to express ideas and rhetorical steps in simple written recount and narrative accurately, fluently and acceptable to interact in the surroundings.

From the description, it can be understood that to reach all of the essential ability in writing, students need to have the ability in developing background knowledge, the ability to use appropriate grammar, appropriate strategy, then they will be able to state their ideas, develop them, and finally produce a good writing.

#### **4. The Factors that Influence Students' Writing Ability**

There are a lot of factors that influence students' ability in the process of learning. According to Purwanto in Nadia Devaga, there are two big factors that influence students in learning process, they are as follows:

- a. Internal factors, which include students' motivation, students' interest, students' talent, students' attitude, students' grammar mastery, students' vocabulary, mastery, reading capability, and personal experience
- b. External factors, which include environmental factors (natural and social factors) and instrumental factors (Curriculum, teacher, facility, management, and administration)<sup>14</sup>

## **5. The Definition of Approach, Method, Technique, Strategy, and the Relationship among Them**

### **a. Definition**

Process of teaching and learning in a classroom cannot be separated from the terms of approach, method, technique, and strategy. They are very important part in it. According to Richards et al, Language teaching is sometimes discussed in terms of three related aspects, they are: approach, method, and technique.<sup>15</sup> A professional teacher should know and understand well about each of its concepts and principles because it is very helpful in creating an effective situation and condition of the process of teaching and learning itself, so that we can equip ourselves as a teacher to organize our classroom practices, and then the goals can be reached. But, sometimes the concept of approaches may make some confuses, not only university students, but also teachers. Apart from that, there are also some terms

---

<sup>14</sup> Nadia Devaga, *The Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph and the Factor that Influence It* (Pekanbaru, Unpublished Undergraduated Thesis of UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, 2008), p. 10

<sup>15</sup> Jack C. Richards *et al.*, *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (London, Pearson Education limited, 1992), p. 30

related to approach, they are method, technique, and strategy. There is a tight relationship among these terms in the case of teaching and learning process. It can be stated that these are also very important. To make it clear, here the writer is going to clarify them one by one before going further to the core of theories in this research.

According to Anthony in Richards and Rodgers, an approach is a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning. An approach is axiomatic. It describes the nature of the subject matter to be taught.<sup>16</sup> In addition, Richards et al also states that approach is the theory, philosophy and principles underlying a particular set of teaching practices.<sup>17</sup> Harmer also states that an approach describes how people acquire their knowledge of the language and make statements about the conditions which will promote successful language learning.<sup>18</sup>

In conclusion, the term of approach can be defined as a starting point, a general view, or beliefs toward the process of teaching and learning, refers to something that provides, inspires, strengthens and forms the background of the process itself. The writer would say that this is our own personal philosophy of teaching. What is the nature of education? What is the role of the teacher, the student, the

---

<sup>16</sup> Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. A Description and Analysis* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 15 (Retrieved on May 25<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

<sup>17</sup> Jack C. Richards, *et al.*, *Op. Cit.*, p. 29

<sup>18</sup> Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, Third Edition, Completely Revised and Updated (Cambridge UK, Longman), p. 78 (Retrieved on May 25<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))



administration, and the parents? To understand one's personal teaching approaches, one must first look to answer these types of questions. And of course, our opinion will change as time goes on - and it may vary depending on the students we are teaching.

Method, in language teaching refers a way of teaching a language which is based on systematic principles and procedures, i.e. which is an application of views on how a language is best taught and learned and a particular theory of language and of language learning, as mentioned by Richards, et al.<sup>19</sup> Anthony in Richards and Rodgers also states that method is the depiction of a general plan of systematic presentation of language based on a chosen approach.<sup>20</sup>

So, it can be stated that method refers to how we apply our answers from the questions stated in approach to our day to day instruction in front of our students. Do we follow the textbooks and curricula to the letter with everything? Are we more of a Socratic teacher and prompt discussion by asking questions to lead students to understanding? Do we advocate learning by doing? Are our students expected to simply listen attentively and take notes (not that any student really does that) with the hopes that they can memorize the facts for assessment? This is not really a question of 'what works for us' but what actual practices and procedures of teaching do we prefer and come most naturally to us. Shortly method is effort to implement an approach.

---

<sup>19</sup> Jack C. Richards, *et al.*, *Op. Cit.*, p. 330

<sup>20</sup> Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers, *Loc. Cit*

Related to technique, In Anthony's notion, it is the activities manifested in the classroom and it has to be specific and consistently in rhyme with the former terms.<sup>21</sup> So, we can say that the technique is the execution from our assumptions and plans. These include any exercise, activities, and tasks in the classroom to meet the objectives or goal of learning. These are the little sneaky tricks we all know and use to get the job done in the classroom.

According to Richards, et al, strategy is procedures used in learning, thinking, etc., which serve as a way of reaching a goal.<sup>22</sup> In addition, strategy means as such activities in the process of teaching and learning that must be done not only by the teacher but also by the students in order to reach the goal effectively. A strategy is usually an intentional or potentially intentional behavior carried out with the goal of learning.

Based on explanation above, it can be concluded that a strategy in the process of teaching and learning should contain a clear explanation about method, procedure, and technique used in it. In other words, learning strategy has a larger scope than method and technique.

#### b. The Relationships among the Terms

It has been clearly stated that approach is a set of correlative assumptions about the nature of language and language learning, a method is a plan for presenting the language material to be learned and

---

<sup>21</sup> Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers, *Ibid*

<sup>22</sup> Jack C. Richards, *et al.*, *Op. Cit.*, p. 515

should be based upon a selected approach, and a technique is a very specific, concrete stratagem or trick designed to accomplish an immediate objective. Strategy is a plan that contains a chain of activities (method and technique) designed to reach a specific goal of the process of teaching and learning. Here we can see the relationships among these terms, Thus we can conclude that approach is translated into strategy that contains method and technique with series of procedure in the process of teaching and learning.

Based on the explanation above, a teacher is required to understand and has a good skill in developing and providing various approach, strategy, method, and technique in doing his or her job professionally.

## **6. The Nature of SRSD**

### **a. Definition**

Self-Regulation Strategy Development (SRSD) is a strategy in the process of teaching and learning. It is a research-based strategy first implemented by Steve Graham and Karen Harris out of the University of Maryland. Thomas states that it is for students with and without disabilities. It is supported by 25 years of research.<sup>23</sup>

Regan and Mastropieri says that Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) for writing is an empirically validated model for

---

<sup>23</sup> Karin Sandmel *et al.*, *Success and Failure with Tier-2 SRSD for Timed-Writing Tests among Second through Fifth-Grade Students with Writing and Behavioral Difficulties Implications for Evidence-Based Practice*, *Advances in Learning and Behavioral Disabilities Volume 24, Assessment and Intervention*, ed. Thomas E. Scruggs and Margo A. Mastropieri (Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 254 (Retrieved on December 20<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

supporting students as they compose text, by helping them develop relevant cognitive and self-regulation skills.<sup>24</sup>

In addition about the definition of Self-Regulated Strategy Development, Hacker, et al states that SRSD is a process developed over the past thirty years for the improvement of writing that “adapts to the teacher’s style while addressing both strengths and needs of students who struggle with learning.”<sup>25</sup>

Sandmel states SRSD involves teaching students a strategy for planning, translating, and reviewing a written composition, along with a self-regulation process that enables students to monitor their own use of the strategy.<sup>26</sup> With SRSD, students are explicitly and systematically taught strategies, self-regulation procedures, and relevant metacognitive knowledge, and are provided with meaningful opportunities to support their development. Furthermore, they come to understand and appreciate the importance of what they are learning, as well as where else it can be applied. SRSD instruction is scaffolded so that the responsibility for applying and recruiting the strategies, knowledge, skills, and self-regulation procedures gradually shifts from the teacher to the students. Throughout the learning process, students actively collaborate with the teacher and each other, and the role of

---

<sup>24</sup> Kelley Regan and Margo A. Mastropieri, *Current Practice Alerts: a Focus on Self Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) for Writing* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Division for Learning Disabilities and the Division for Research, 2009), p. 1 (Retrieved on December 20<sup>th</sup> 2012 from [teachingld.org](http://teachingld.org))

<sup>25</sup> Karen R. Harris, et. al., *Handbook of Metacognition in Education, Metacognition and Children’s Writing*, ed. Douglas J. Hacker, et al. (New York, Madison Ave, 2009), pp. 142-150 (Retrieved on May 25<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

<sup>26</sup> Karin Sandmel et al., *Op. Cit.*, p. 141

student effort is emphasized and rewarded. With SRSD, the focus and process of instruction are individualized based on the students' unique needs and capabilities. Instruction is further differentiated by adjusting goals, feedback, and instructional support in response to the students' current levels of performance and rates of progress. Moreover, SRSD instruction is criterion- rather than time-based; students move through the instructional process at their own pace.

In conclusion, SRSD can be understood from the name, self-regulation strategy development means teacher provides a strategy to students and then let them develop the strategy by using their own ways, it can be stated that it is an instructional strategy designed to improve a writer's strategic behavior, knowledge and motivation.

b. Characteristics of SRSD

There are five critical characteristics of SRSD instruction.<sup>27</sup>

- 1) Writing (genre specific and general) strategies and self-regulation strategies, as well as declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge are explicitly taught and supported in development.
- 2) Children are viewed as active collaborators who work with the teacher and each other during instruction.
- 3) Instruction is individualized so that the processes, skills, and knowledge targeted for instruction are tailored to children's needs and capabilities. Goals are adjusted to current performance for each

---

<sup>27</sup> Karin Sandmel *et al.*, *Ibid.*, pp. 261-263

student, with more capable writers addressing more advanced goals. Instruction is further individualized through the use of individually tailored feedback and support.

- 4) Instruction is criterion based rather than time based; students move through the instructional process at their own pace and do not proceed to later stages of instruction until they have met criteria for doing so. Importantly, instruction does not end until the student can use the strategy and self-regulation procedures efficiently and effectively.
- 5) SRSD is an on-going process in which new strategies are introduced and previously taught strategies are upgraded over time.

c. The Goals of the Strategy

- 1) Help students learn and independently apply powerful writing strategies that allow for the accomplishment of specific compositional tasks.
- 2) Ensure students acquire the procedural, declarative, and conditional knowledge needed to effectively use the strategies;
- 3) Support students' development of self-regulation procedures that help manage the writing strategies and the task of composing;
- 4) Enhance specific aspects of motivation, including attitude, self-efficacy, and effort.

d. The Advantages

Following SRSD has two major advantages as stated by Reid and Lienemann:

- 1) A good model gives you an instructional road map to follow. You know how to teach the strategy in an *effective, systematic, step-by-step* fashion. This ensures that critical steps in the strategy instruction process are not omitted or shortchanged.
- 2) Second, strategy instruction involves a commitment of time and effort on the part of the teacher. To maximize the chances of a positive outcome (i.e., increased academic performance for students), it is crucial to use approaches that have been well validated.<sup>28</sup>

e. The Stages and Teaching Procedures<sup>29</sup>

Here the writer presents the stages in a commonly used sequence; however, they can be reordered or combined as deemed appropriate or necessary by the teacher.

- 1) Development of Background Knowledge
- 2) Discussion of the strategy
- 3) Modeling of the strategy
- 4) Memorization of the Strategy
- 5) Support the Strategy
- 6) Independent Performance

---

<sup>28</sup> Robert Reid and Torri Ortiz Lienemann, *Strategy Instruction for Students with Learning Disabilities, What Works for Special-Needs Learners*, ed. Karen R. Haris and Steve Graham (New York, The Guilford Press, 2006), p. 33 (Retrieved on October 1<sup>st</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

<sup>29</sup> Karen R. Harris, *et. al.*, *Metacognition and Strategies Instruction in Writing, Metacognition, Strategy Use, and Instruction*, ed. Harriet Salatas Waters and Wolfgang Schneider (New York, The Guilford Press A Division of Guilford Publications, Inc, 2010), p. 240 (Retrieved on December 20<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu))

Stage 1 begins by using techniques to activate and develop students' background knowledge and teach pre-requisite skills needed to move to stage 2. In stage 2, a writing strategy is introduced. Students are taught the purpose and the benefits of using the strategy as well as the steps to the process. Stage 3 is when the teacher models the strategy using the "think aloud" method of instruction. During this stage, the teacher also models specific self-regulatory strategies. Step 4 is where students begin to memorize and become automatic in completing the steps to the writing strategy. They can establish their own self-regulatory techniques or select appropriate ones from a list created by the class or classroom teacher. Step 5 focuses on collaboration between the students and the teacher. The teacher provides constructive social feedback, support, and guidance as needed with the goal of fading support as students become more proficient in the process. The final stage, stage 6 is the independent performance stage when the student is able to use both the writing strategy and self-instruction techniques to produce a written product that meets expectations established by the student and the teacher.

f. WWW, What=2, How=2 Strategy

According to Reid and Lienemann, there are many effective teaching strategies in SRSD. Especially for narrative writing, WWW, What=2, How=2 is appropriate. These can be presented in the form of chart or graphic organizer. The steps of using this strategy below:



- 1) Think of a story to share with others.

Step 1, to think of a story that they would like to share with others. Considering their audience and what their audience's needs and wants is important. Most of the time, this sets the tone for the composition. Students are then reminded.

- 2) Let their mind be free.

Step 2, to let their mind be free. This is intended to increase students' focus on the task of composing by having them free their minds of distractions and focus on their story.

- 3) Write down the story part reminder: WWW, What = 2 How = 2

- a) *Who* is the main character? *Who* else is in the story?
- b) *When* does the story take place?
- c) *Where* does the story take place?
- d) *What* does the main character do?
- e) *What* happens when they try to do it?
- f) *How* does the story end?
- g) *How* does the main character feel?

The third step of the strategy is prompting the students to write down the story part reminder: WWW, What = 2, How = 2. This step helps students start to plan and organize their stories, keeping in mind the essential components of a story. Having students write down the questions before they start writing down their ideas ensures that they will attend to each of the essential

components, not just start writing without consideration of these crucial elements.

4) Write down story part ideas for each part.

In the fourth step students are asked to write down story part ideas for each story part. This is where the students get to put in their ideas. Answering the story part questions will help them with the initial generation of content for their stories.

5) Write the story. Use good parts and make sense.

In the final step, students put together all of their ideas into a complete paragraph. Students are reminded to use good parts, and make sense. After all of the steps are completed students should have a narrative composition that is interesting to their audience and easy to follow, and possesses all the essential components of a good story.<sup>30</sup>

## **7. The Effect of SRSD toward Students' Writing Ability**

Many people include the students want to be a good writer, but most of people or students always have problem and difficulties to write a good writing. Many students of this school think that writing is one of the difficult language skills to be mastered. The problems might be derived from the students, the materials, the teachers, or even the strategy applied in teaching-learning process.

Related to the teachers' side, the teachers have already applied some strategies such as discussion, drafting, and word mapping but

---

<sup>30</sup> Robert Reid and Torri Ortiz Lienemann, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 115-144

students still have some mistakes and difficulties. A mistake to choose a strategy will cause a failure in teaching-learning process. Finally the teaching goals can not be reached.

In fact, the students' writing ability has to be improved. In this case, teacher needs other strategies to improve the students' writing ability. There are some strategies to increase the writing ability, and one of them is Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD). SRSD is a particularly effective strategy for teaching writing.<sup>31</sup> In addition, since 1985, more than 40 studies using the SRSD model of instruction have been reported in the area of writing, involving students from the elementary grades through high school.<sup>32</sup> Harriet states that SRSD instruction has a significant and meaningful impact on students' writing knowledge, writing behavior, and writing performance.<sup>33</sup> In the true and quasi experimental design studies, SRSD has had the strongest impact of any strategies instruction in writing. This strategy has some good affects toward students' writing ability as defined by some linguistic that SRSD can affects students' writing ability.

As writing involves three fundamental processes; (1) Planning what to write and how to organize the composition, (2) translating that

---

<sup>31</sup> Steve Graham and Dolores Perin, *Writing Next, Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools* (New York, Carnegie Corporation, 2007), p. 16 (Retrieved on May 22<sup>nd</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nyu](http://www.library.nyu))

<sup>32</sup> Karen R. Harris, *et. al.*, *Handbook of Metacognition in Education, Metacognition and Children's Writing*, ed. Douglas J. Hacker, et al., *Loc. Cit.*, p. 142

<sup>33</sup> Karin R. Haris, *et. al.*, *Metacognition and Strategies Instruction in Writing, Metacognition, Strategy Use, and Instruction*, ed. Harriet Salatas Waters and Wolfgang Schneider, *Op. Cit.*, p. 244

into written language, and (3) revising what is written to make improvements, it requires constant self-regulation and attention control. Reid and Lienemann say that skilled writers use strategies to plan, write, and revise their compositions, as well as strategies to self-regulate performance.<sup>34</sup> So, it can be stated that SRSD is one of the appropriate strategies in writing. In conclusion, a careful using of SRSD in teaching writing, however, sends a positive message to improve the students' writing ability, especially for writing narrative paragraph.

## **B. Relevant Research**

There are some of relevant researches which have relevancy with this research. The first is "I am a raindrop!" Narrative Writing Strategies and Self-Regulated Strategy Development for Fourth and Fifth Grade Students with Writing and Behavioral Difficulties by Karin Sandmel. The participants in this study were 8 fourth (N = 4) and fifth (N = 4) grade students (6 boys, 2 girls) in the Southeastern United States. A multiple probe across participants with multiple probes at baseline design (Horner & Baer, 1978) was used to evaluate the effects of the SRSD approach and writing strategies (TACO and TOWER) for improving the number of story elements, evidence of strategy use, writing quality, and length of composition for students who struggle with writing and behavior difficulties. It is stated in the research that this study makes an

---

<sup>34</sup> Robert Reid and Torri Ortiz Lienemann, *Op. Cit.*, p. 125

important contribution to the literature based on the findings. Fourth and fifth grade students, with writing and behavior difficulties, within a three-tiered model of prevention, were able to improve the total number of writing elements included in their writing. Another important contribution of this study is the modifications of the SRSD approach and writing strategies that were identified to support fourth and fifth grade students with writing and behavior difficulties.<sup>35</sup>

The second is Improving the Students' Ability in Writing Expository Paragraph through Self-Regulated Strategy Development at STAI Rakha Amuntai South Kalimantan by Sari Ninaya. It is an action research in which both the researcher and her collaborator worked together in planning, implementing, observing the action, and reflecting on the data collected from the teaching and learning process and the students' writing products. The subjects of this research were 25 students of the fourth semester students of the English Department at STAI Rakha Amuntai in the academic year 2009/2010. The findings indicated that using the SRSD model could improve the students' ability in writing expository paragraphs.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>Karin Sandmel, *"I am a raindrop!" Narrative Writing Strategies and Self-Regulated Strategy Development for Fourth and Fifth Grade Students with Writing and Behavioral Difficulties* (Nashville, Tennessee, Graduate School of Vanderbilt University, 2010), pp. 45-59 (electronic version and retrieved on February 20<sup>th</sup> 2013 from [http://etd.library.vanderbilt.edu/available/etd-07212010-40129/unrestricted/Sandmel\\_Dissertation.pdf](http://etd.library.vanderbilt.edu/available/etd-07212010-40129/unrestricted/Sandmel_Dissertation.pdf))

<sup>36</sup>Sari Ninaya, *Improving the Students' Ability in Writing Expository Paragraph through Self-Regulated Strategy Development at STAI Rakha Amuntai-South Kalimantan*, (Malang, Unpublished Thesis of English Language Education, Graduate Program of State University of Malang, 2010), p. 1 (electronic version and retrieved on February 20<sup>th</sup> 2013 from <http://library.um.ac.id/free-contents/index.php/pub/detail/improving-the-students-ability-in-writing-expository-paragraph-through-self-regulated-strategy-development-at-atai-rakha-amuntai-south-kalimantan-ninaya-sari-45766.html>)

The relevant researches above provide huge contribution to the writer's research. The writer got so much information that are related to writing a narrative paragraph. Based on that case, the writer bravely is going to do research on the difference between using and without using SRSD in writing a paragraph. But, the writer's research is so much different from Karin Sandmel's and Sari Ninaya's research. It is more specific, that is the effect of using SRSD to increase the ability in writing a narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

### **C. Operational Concept**

Operational concept is a concept that guides the readers to avoid misunderstanding on the subject of the research. It should be interpreted into particular words in order to be easier measured. It gives clear description of the variables. As mentioned by Syafi'i that all related theoretical frameworks can be operated in the operational concept.<sup>37</sup> So that the writer made reference to the related theories that have been explained to formalize the operational concept.

There are two variables in this research; they are variable X as SRSD and variable Y as students' writing ability in writing narrative paragraph. Thus, the writer determines some indicators of both variables.

---

<sup>37</sup> Syafi'i, *Op. Cit.*, p. 122

The indicators of using SRSD (variable X) are as follows:

1. Teacher introduces himself as the writing (narrative) teacher
2. Teacher provides a discussion and brainstorming about how to write a narrative paragraph successfully, writing purpose, and what skills are needed to meet the goal of writing narrative paragraph
3. Teacher asks the students to think of a story to be shared.
4. Teacher lets the students' mind be free.
5. Teacher sells the WWW, What= 2, How= 2 strategy to the students enthusiastically
6. Teacher models how to use the writing strategy using "think aloud"
7. Teacher asks the students to memorize the strategy
8. Teacher asks the students to write down the story part reminder: WWW, What= 2, How= 2
9. Teacher asks the students to write down story part ideas for each part.
10. Teacher provides whatever supports for students' needs (small group work, re-modeling the strategy, prompting steps, corrective feedback) to move from their current level of performance to independence in the use of the strategy
11. Teacher asks the students to write a narrative paragraph independently
12. Assessment of instruction

The following are the indicators of student' ability in writing narrative paragraph (variable Y). they are related to the indicators stated in the syllabus of the English subject for the second year students of SMP Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

1. Students are able to develop background knowledge of a narrative topic
2. Students are able to use suitable tenses in writing narrative paragraph
3. Students have appropriate strategy in writing a narrative paragraph
4. Students can state their ideas and develop it into a good narrative paragraph<sup>38</sup>

#### **D. Assumption and Hypothesis**

##### **1. Assumption**

In general, the assumption of such research can be expressed that:

- a. Students' writing ability is various.
- b. There are some teaching strategies that can affect students' writing ability.

##### **2. Hypothesis**

Based on the assumption above, the hypothesis of this study can be forwarded as follows:

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant difference between using and without using Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

H<sub>a</sub>: There is a significant difference between using and without using Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

---

<sup>38</sup> SMP Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru, Syllabus of English (Pekanbaru, SMP Al-Ishlah, 2010)



### CHAPTER III

#### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

##### A. The Research Design

The design of this research is quasi-experimental with nonequivalent control group. John Creswell states that it is experimental situation in which the researcher assign participants to groups, but not randomly.<sup>1</sup> This design requires at least two groups, one that receives a new and another that receives a traditional, or control treatment. Both groups are post-tested. The writer used one class as experimental group and it got a new treatment, while another was the control group and it got traditional treatment. In this case,  $X_1$  = in-service training and  $X_2$  = no in-service training.<sup>2</sup> This research consisted of two variables; the independent variable symbolized by “X” that was the effect of using SRSD while the dependent one as “Y” which refers to students’ ability in writing narrative paragraph. The writer assigned pre-test and post-test both to the experimental and control class in conducting the research. But the treatment activity was for the experimental class only. Briefly, the research was designed by the following table.

**Table III. 1**  
**Research Design**

| Class        | Pre-test | Treatment | Post-test |
|--------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Experimental | V        | V         | V         |
| Control      | V        | X         | V         |

---

<sup>1</sup> John W Creswell, *Educational Research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (New York, Pearson Prentice-Hall, 2008), p. 313

<sup>2</sup> Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian, *Educational Research* (New Jersey, Prentice-Hall. Inc, 2000), p. 389

Where:

V = with particular test or treatment

X = without particular test or treatment

## **B. The Time and Location of the Research**

The research was conducted from May until June 2012 at the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.

## **C. The Subject and the Object of the Research**

The subject of this research was the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru, while the object of this research was the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph through SRSD.

## **D. The Population and the Sample**

The population of this research was the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru. There were three classes, they were VIII A (22 students) and VIII B (20 students), and VIII C (22 students). So, the total number of population was 64 students. In addition, writer took only two classes from three classes as sample of the research by using random sampling, because the three classes were on the same level. The sample was divided into two groups. The first was experimental class, it was VIII A (22 students), while another was control class, it was VIII C (22 students). These can be seen in the table below.

**Table III. 2**  
**The Population and the Sample of the Research**

| <b>No</b> | <b>Class</b> | <b>Population</b> | <b>Sample</b>      |
|-----------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1         | VIII A       | 22                | Experimental Class |
| 2         | VIII B       | 20                | Try Out            |
| 3         | VIII C       | 22                | Control Class      |

#### **E. The Technique of Data Collection**

The writer used some tests as the instruments of this research. It was used to find out how the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph taught by using SRSD is, to find out how the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph taught by conventional technique is, and to find out whether there is or not a significant difference between using and without using SRSD to increase the students' ability in writing narrative. The materials of the tests were based on the syllabus of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru. It can be seen from the following blueprint of the test (Table III. 3). The tests were done through giving the students a command to write a narrative paragraph by using SRSD for experimental class and without using SRSD for control class. In order to analyze the students' ability in writing the paragraph, the writer used graduated standard of English lesson in Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru (SKL) that is 70 points for students' ability in writing narrative text.

**Table III. 3**  
**The Blueprint of the Test**

| No | Basic Competence  | Class/<br>Smt | Source   | Indicator  | Instrument  | Item<br>No. |
|----|---|---------------|--|--|---|-------------|
| 1  | Expressing the meaning and the steps of rhetoric of simple short essay by using variety of written language accurately, fluently, and acceptable to interact with the surroundings in the form of recount and narrative | VIII/<br>2    | English in Focus for Grade VIII Junior High School (SMP/MTs) p.100 | Write a simple and short text in the form of narrative rhetorically. | Please choose one of the narrative titles below and then write a paragraph based on the title you have chosen:<br>1. Cinderella<br>2. Malin Kundang<br>3. Danau Toba<br>4. The Deer and the Crocodile | 1           |

According to Suharsimi Arikunto, there are three phases that should be done by a researcher to get the data of the research, namely pre-test, treatment, and post-test.<sup>3</sup> Below are the short description of the phases that have been done by the writer to get the data:

1. Pre-test

It was a test which was administered at the beginning of the research. It was used to determine the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph before getting some treatments from the teacher (writer). The pre-test referred to the curriculum and based on the blueprint of the test that has been prepared before (Table III. 3). Both classes got the same test.

2. Treatment

The students were given some treatments after the pre-test for about 6 meetings. It was for motivating and helping the students of experimental class in writing narrative paragraph. SRSD was used there.

The writer prepared the material before the treatment. It must be in line

---

<sup>3</sup> Suharsimi Arikunto, *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan* (Jakarta, Rineka Cipta, 2009), p. 245

with the curriculum, syllabus, and material of English at junior high school Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru. To make it clear, the following is the blueprint of the treatment in experimental class.

**Table III. 4**  
**The Blueprint of Treatment**

| No | Meeting | Topic                               | Source   |
|----|---------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1  | 1       | Pre-test                            | 1. English in Focus for Grade VIII Junior High School (SMP/MTs)<br>2. Internet |
| 2  | 2       | Celebration around the World        |  |
| 3  | 3       | Celebration around the World        |  |
| 4  | 4       | Once upon A Time                    |  |
| 5  | 5       | Once upon A Time                    |  |
| 6  | 6       | A Friend in Need is A Friend indeed |  |
| 7  | 7       | A Friend in Need is A Friend indeed |  |
| 8  | 8       | Post-test                           |  |

### 3. Post-test

It was a test which was done after the treatments. Both classes got the same test. The material of pos-test were the same as the pre-test. The result of the test was analyzed to make conclusion.

## F. The Techniques of the Data Analysis

It needs some appropriate techniques of data analysis to find out the intended result of the research, of course. The writer used t-test as the techniques of data analysis in this research. It is one of statistical formula used to find out if 'there is or there is no' statistically significant difference from two mean of variables that being compared, in this case, it was the mean score of posttests of experimental class and control class. Then the data were analyzed by using the following formula of the t-test:<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Hartono, *Statistik Untuk Penelitian* (Yogyakarta, Pustaka Pelajar, 2004), p. 34

$$t_o = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Where:

$t_o$  = value obtained

$M_x$  = mean score of experimental group

$M_y$  = mean score of control group

$SD_x$  = standard deviation of x

$SD_y$  = standard deviation of y

$N$  = number of student

## 1. Scoring

The writer used the ESL composition profile in scoring the students' ability in writing. As mentioned by Hughey, et al., the profiles consist of five components; they are content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The following measurement were used:<sup>5</sup>

**Table III. 5**  
**ESL Composition Profile**

| CONTENT |   |
|---------|---|
| Range   | Criteria  |
| 30-27   | <b>Excellent to very good</b><br>Knowledgeable, substantive, through development of thesis, and relevant to assigned topic.                         |
| 26-22   | <b>Good to average</b><br>Some knowledgeable of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail. |
| 21-17   | <b>Fair to poor</b><br>Limited knowledgeable of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.   |
| 16-13   | <b>Very poor</b><br>Does not to show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.                               |

<sup>5</sup> Jane B. Hughey, et al, *Teaching ESL Composition: Principles and Techniques*, (Rowley, Massachusetts, Newbury House Publishers, 1983), p. 140

### ORGANIZATION

| Range | Criteria   |
|-------|--|
| 20-18 | <b>Excellent to very good</b><br>Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/ supported, well organized, logical sequencing, and cohesive.           |
| 17-14 | <b>Very good to average</b><br>Somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stands out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. |
| 21-17 | <b>Fair to poor</b><br>Non-fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.                                     |
| 9-7   | <b>Very poor</b><br>Essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idiom, word form. Not enough to evaluate                    |

### VOCABULARY

| Range | Criteria  |
|-------|---|
| 20-18 | <b>Excellent to very good</b><br>Sophisticated range, effective word/ idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register |
| 17-14 | <b>Good to average</b><br>Adequate range, occasional errors of word/ idiom form and usage but meaning not obscured                    |
| 21-17 | <b>Fair to poor</b><br>Limited range, frequent errors of word/ idiom form, choice, and usage, meaning confused or obscured            |
| 9-7   | <b>Very poor</b><br>Does not communicate, no organization or not enough to evaluate.  |

### LANGUAGE USE

| Range | Criteria   |
|-------|--|
| 25-22 | <b>Excellent to very good</b><br>Effective complex construction, few errors of agreement; tenses, number, word order/ function; articles; pronouns; preposition  |
| 21-18 | <b>Very good to average</b><br>Effective but simple construction, minor problems in complex constructions, several errors of agreement; tense; number; word order/ functions; articles; pronouns; preposition; but never obscured                |
| 17-11 | <b>Fair to poor</b><br>Major problems in simple/ complex constructions, frequent errors of negation; agreement; tense; number; word order/ functions; articles; pronouns; preposition; and or fragments, deletions, meaning confused or obscured |
| 10-5  | <b>Very poor</b><br>Virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate, or not enough to evaluate  |

### MECHANICS

| Range | Criteria   |
|-------|--|
| 5     | <b>Excellent to very good</b><br>Demonstrates mastery of convention, few errors of spelling; punctuation; capitalization; and paragraphing                                     |
| 4     | <b>Very good to average</b><br>Occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, but meaning not obscured  |
| 3     | <b>Fair to poor</b><br>Frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, meaning confused or obscured                                  |
| 2     | <b>Very poor</b><br>No mastery of convention, dominated by errors of spelling; punctuation; capitalization; and paragraphing, handwriting illegible, or not enough to evaluate |



The following is the table of the specification of the test. It consists of the components of writing that have been assessed and the highest score of each components:

**Table III. 6**  
**The Specification of the Test**

| <b>No</b>    | <b>Components</b> | <b>Highest Score</b> |
|--------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1            | Content           | 30                   |
| 2            | Organization      | 20                   |
| 3            | Vocabulary        | 20                   |
| 4            | Language Use      | 25                   |
| 5            | Mechanics         | 5                    |
| <b>Total</b> |                   | <b>100</b>           |

The following is the table of the classification of students' score of the test:<sup>6</sup>

**Table III. 7**  
**The Classification of Students' Score**

| <b>The Score Level</b> | <b>Category</b> |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| 80-100                 | Very Good       |
| 66-79                  | Good            |
| 56-65                  | Enough          |
| 40-55                  | Less            |
| 30-39                  | Fail            |

And the following formula was used in determining the percentage of increase and decrease of students' ability.

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{Gain Score}}{\text{Pre - test Score}} \times 100\%$$

---

<sup>6</sup> Suharsimi Arikunto, *Loc. Cit*

## 2. Evaluator Team

The writer cooperated with two raters in evaluating the students' writing performance in order to produce consistent judgment on the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph. Discussing about raters, Jacobs et al. in Sulasmi says that raters are persons who participate in cooperative evaluation of written composition tests, and their cooperation is as a part of school testing program.<sup>7</sup> The raters that have the evaluated students' score were as follows:

- 1) Kurnia Budiyanti, M.Pd. She graduated from English Education Department of University of Riau in 2006 and her graduate program was in State University of Padang in 2010. She is one of lecturers in English education department of UIN Suska Riau.
- 2) Jonri Kasdi, S, Pd.I. He graduated from English Education department of UIN Suska Riau in 2006. He is one of lecturer at Language Center of UIN Suska Riau.

---

<sup>7</sup> Sulasmi Karim, *An Experiment on the Effectiveness of Using Brainstorming Technique in Increasing Students' Writing Ability at the Second Year of English Education Department State Islamic University of Suska Riau*. (Pekanbaru, UIN Suska, 2007), p. 30

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **A. Description of the Research Variable**

This research consists of two variables; they are X, teaching by using SRSD and Y, the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph at the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru. Therefore, X is independent variable and Y is dependent variable in this research.

#### **B. Data Presentation**

The data of the research were the score of the students' pre-test and post-test both in experimental class and control class.

##### **1. The Data Presentation of the Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph**

##### **a. The Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph by Using SRSD**

The Data of the students' writing ability in narrative paragraph by using SRSD were gotten from pre-test and post-test of the experimental class (VIII 3). The writer taught and the English teacher observed the writer for eight meetings. The data can be seen from the table below.

**Table IV. 1**  
**The Score of the Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph**  
**by Using SRSD**

| Student      | Score of Pre-test | Score of Post-test | Gain Score   |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 1            | 71.5              | 80.5               | 9            |
| 2            | 69                | 83                 | 14           |
| 3            | 76.5              | 78                 | 1.5          |
| 4            | 75.5              | 86                 | 10.5         |
| 5            | 81                | 83.5               | 2.5          |
| 6            | 67.5              | 83                 | 15.5         |
| 7            | 67                | 85.5               | 18.5         |
| 8            | 74                | 90                 | 16           |
| 9            | 69                | 77.5               | 8.5          |
| 10           | 77                | 84                 | 7            |
| 11           | 78                | 85                 | 7            |
| 12           | 76.5              | 90                 | 13.5         |
| 13           | 64.5              | 82.5               | 18           |
| 14           | 70.5              | 83                 | 12.5         |
| 15           | 80.5              | 79.5               | -1           |
| 16           | 73.5              | 79.5               | 6            |
| 17           | 71.5              | 78.5               | 7            |
| 18           | 66                | 75.5               | 9.5          |
| 19           | 71                | 88                 | 17           |
| 20           | 69.5              | 77.5               | 8            |
| 21           | 75                | 85                 | 10           |
| 22           | 67                | 83                 | 16           |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>1591.5</b>     | <b>1818</b>        | <b>226.5</b> |

From the table above the writer found that the total score of the pre-test of the experimental group was **1591** while the total score of post-test was **1818**. The highest score of the pre-test was **81** and the lowest was **64.5**, while the highest score of post-test was **90** and the lowest was **75.5**. these mean that there were significant increasing of their writing ability in writing narrative paragraph. It is proved by the total score and the frequency from pre-test and post-test which is significantly different, and it can be seen below:

**Table IV. 2**  
**The Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class**

| <b>Score of Pre-test</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> | <b>Score of Post-test</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 70                       | 9                | 40.909                | 70                        | -                | -                     |
| 71-75                    | 7                | 31.818                | 71-75                     | 1                | 4.545                 |
| 76-80                    | 5                | 22.727                | 76-80                     | 7                | 31.818                |
| 81-85                    | 1                | 4.545                 | 81-85                     | 10               | 45.454                |
| 86-90                    | -                | -                     | 86-90                     | 4                | 18.181                |
| 91-95                    | -                | -                     | 91-95                     | -                | -                     |
| 96-100                   | -                | -                     | 96-100                    | -                | -                     |
|                          | <b>N=22</b>      | <b>100%</b>           |                           | <b>N=22</b>      | <b>100%</b>           |

It can be seen from the table above that in pre-test there were 9 students who got 70 (40.909%), 7 students who got 71-75 (31.818%), 5 students who got 76-80 (22.727%) and 1 student who got 76-80 (4.545%). The highest frequency was 9 at the score of 70. While in post test none of the students who got 70 (0%), 1 student who got 71-75 (4.545%), 7 students who got 76-80 (31.818%), 10 students who got 81-85 (45.454%). The highest frequency was 10 at the score of 81-85. The total number of frequency was 22.

**Table IV. 3**  
**The Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class**

|                  | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard Deviation</b> |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Pre-test</b>  | 72.341      | 5.93                      |
| <b>Post-test</b> | 82.636      | 7.15                      |

The distance between Mean ( $Mx$ ) and Standard Deviation ( ) is too far. In the other words, the scores obtained are normal.

The Following are the tables of the scores of pre-test and post-test of experimental class on all aspects of writing.

## 1) Content

**Table IV. 4**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Content of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 27-30              | Excellent to Very Good | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| 22-26              | Good to Average        | 2           | 9.091       | 13          | 59.091      |
| 17-21              | Fair to Poor           | 19          | 86.364      | 9           | 40.909      |
| 13-16              | Very Poor              | 1           | 4.545       | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there was 1 student who got very poor level, 19 students who got fair to poor level, 2 students who got good to average level, and none of the students who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test 9 students who got fair to poor level, 13 students who got good to average level, and none of the students who got excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 19 at the score of fair to poor level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 13 at the score of good to average level. The total frequency was 22.

## 2) Organization

**Table IV. 5**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Organization of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 18-20              | Excellent to Very Good | 1           | 4.545       | 16          | 72.727      |
| 14-17              | Good to Average        | 21          | 95.455      | 6           | 27.273      |
| 13-10              | Fair to Poor           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| 9-7                | Very Poor              | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that none of the students who got score of very poor level and fair to poor level, 21 students who got good to average level, and 1 of the students who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test none of the students who got fair to poor level, 6 students who got good to average level, and 16 students who got excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 21 at the score of good to average level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 16 at the score of excellent to very good level. The total frequency was 22.

### 3) Vocabulary

**Table IV. 6**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Vocabulary of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 18-20              | Excellent to Very Good | 1           | 4.545       | 17          | 77.273      |
| 14-17              | Good to Average        | 19          | 86.364      | 5           | 22.727      |
| 13-10              | Fair to Poor           | 2           | 9.091       | -           | -           |
| 9-7                | Very Poor              | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that none of the students who got very poor level, 2 students who got fair to poor level, 19 students who got good to average level, and 1 student who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test none of the students who got fair to poor level, 5 students who got good to average level, and 17 of the students who got excellent to

very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 19 at the score of good to average level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 17 at the score of excellent to very good level. The total frequency was 22.

#### 4) Language Use

**Table IV. 7**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Language Use of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 22-25              | Excellent to Very Good | -           | -           | 3           | 13.636      |
| 18-21              | Good to Average        | 13          | 59.091      | 17          | 77.273      |
| 17-11              | Fair to Poor           | 9           | 40.909      | 2           | 9.091       |
| 10-5               | Very Poor              | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there was no student who got very poor level, 9 students who got fair to poor level, 13 students who got good to average level, and none of the students who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test 2 students who got fair to poor level, 17 students who got good to average level, and 3 students who got excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 13 at the score of good to average level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 17 at the score of good to average level. The total frequency was 22.



## 5) Mechanics

**Table IV. 8**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Mechanics of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 5                  | Excellent to Very Good | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| 4                  | Good to Average        | 5           | 22.727      | 12          | 54.545      |
| 3                  | Fair to Poor           | 15          | 68.182      | 10          | 45.455      |
| 2                  | Very Poor              | 2           | 9.091       | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there was 2 students who got very poor level, 15 students who got fair to poor level, 5 students who got good to average level, and none of the students who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test there was no student who got very poor level, 10 students who got fair to poor level, 12 students who got good to average level, and none of the students who got excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 15 at the score of fair to poor level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 12 at the score of good to average level. The total frequency was 22.

### b. The Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph by Using Conventional Technique

The Data of students' writing ability in narrative paragraph by using conventional technique were gotten from pre-test and post-test of the control class (VIII 1). The data can be seen from the table below.

**Table IV. 9**  
**The Score of the Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph**  
**by Using Conventional Technique**

| <b>Student</b> | <b>Score of Pre-test</b> | <b>Score of Post-test</b> | <b>Gain Score</b> |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| 1              | 76                       | 82                        | 6                 |
| 2              | 80.5                     | 75                        | -5.5              |
| 3              | 60.5                     | 73                        | 12.5              |
| 4              | 70.5                     | 80                        | 9.5               |
| 5              | 72.5                     | 79.5                      | 7                 |
| 6              | 63                       | 73.5                      | 10.5              |
| 7              | 69                       | 74.5                      | 5.5               |
| 8              | 74                       | 78                        | 4                 |
| 9              | 77                       | 80.5                      | 3.5               |
| 10             | 74                       | 76.5                      | 2.5               |
| 11             | 72                       | 75                        | 3                 |
| 12             | 70.5                     | 77                        | 6.5               |
| 13             | 70                       | 75.5                      | 5.5               |
| 14             | 83.5                     | 82.5                      | -1                |
| 15             | 65                       | 74                        | 9                 |
| 16             | 80                       | 77                        | -3                |
| 17             | 60                       | 74                        | 14                |
| 18             | 71                       | 74                        | 3                 |
| 19             | 75                       | 77                        | 2                 |
| 20             | 78                       | 90                        | 12                |
| 21             | 70.5                     | 84.5                      | 14                |
| 22             | 77                       | 79                        | 2                 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b>1589.5</b>            | <b>1712</b>               | <b>122.5</b>      |

From the table above, the writer found that the total score of the pre-test of the control class was **1589.5** while the total score of post-test was **1712**. The highest score of the pre-test was **83.5** and the lowest was **60**, while the highest score of post-test was **90** and the lowest was **73**. these mean that there was increasing of their ability in writing narrative paragraph. Besides, the Mean of pre-test and post-test of the class also has a big difference. The frequency and the Mean of pre-test and post-test can be seen below:

**Table IV. 10**  
**The Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class**

| <b>Score of Pre-test</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> | <b>Score of Post-test</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 70                       | 9                | 40.909                | 70                        | -                | -                     |
| 71-75                    | 6                | 27.272                | 71-75                     | 9                | 40.909                |
| 76-80                    | 6                | 27.272                | 76-80                     | 9                | 40.909                |
| 81-85                    | 1                | 4.545                 | 81-85                     | 3                | 13.636                |
| 86-90                    | -                | -                     | 86-90                     | 1                | 4.545                 |
| 91-95                    | -                | -                     | 91-95                     | -                | -                     |
| 96-100                   | -                | -                     | 96-100                    | -                | -                     |
|                          | <b>N=22</b>      | <b>100%</b>           |                           | <b>N=22</b>      | <b>100%</b>           |

It can be seen from the table above that in pre-test there were 9 students who got 70 (40.909%), 6 students who got 71-75 (27.272%), 6 students who got 76-80 (27.272%) and 1 student who got 76-80 (4.545%). The highest frequency was 9 at the score of 70. While in post test none of the students who got 70 (0%), 9 student who got 71-75 (40.909%), 9 students who got 76-80 (40.909%), 3 students who got 81-85 (13.636%), and 1 student who got 86-90 (4.545). The highest frequency was 9 both at the score of 71-75 and 81-85. The total number of frequency was 22.

**Table IV. 11**  
**The Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class**

|                  | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard Deviation</b> |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Pre-test</b>  | 72.250      |                           |
| <b>Post-test</b> | 77.818      |                           |

The distance between Mean ( $Mx$ ) and Standard Deviation ( ) is too far. In the other words, the scores obtained are normal.

The Following are the tables of the scores of pre-test and post-test of control class on all aspects of writing.

## 1) Content

**Table IV. 12**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Content of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 27-30              | Excellent to Very Good | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| 22-26              | Good to Average        | 3           | 13.636      | 4           | 18.182      |
| 17-21              | Fair to Poor           | 13          | 59.091      | 18          | 81.818      |
| 13-16              | Very Poor              | 6           | 27.273      | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there were 6 students who got very poor level, 13 students who got fair to poor level, 3 students who got good to average level, and none of the students who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test 18 students who got fair to poor level, 4 students who got good to average level, and none of the students who got excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test was 13 at the score of fair to poor level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 18 at the score of fair to poor level. The total frequency was 22.

## 2) Organization

**Table IV. 13**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Organization of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 18-20              | Excellent to Very Good | 3           | 13.636      | 7           | 31.818      |
| 14-17              | Good to Average        | 17          | 77.273      | 15          | 68.182      |
| 13-10              | Fair to Poor           | 2           | 9.091       | -           | -           |
| 9-7                | Very Poor              | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that none of the students who got very poor level, 2 students who got fair to poor level, 17 students who got good to average level, and 3 students who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test none of the students who got very poor level and fair to poor level, 15 students who got good to average level, and 7 students who got excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 17 at the good to average level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 15 at the score of good to average level. The total frequency was 22.

### 3) Vocabulary

**Table IV. 14**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Vocabulary of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 18-20              | Excellent to Very Good | 6           | 27.273      | 8           | 36.364      |
| 14-17              | Good to Average        | 15          | 68.182      | 14          | 63.636      |
| 13-10              | Fair to Poor           | 1           | 4.545       | -           | -           |
| 9-7                | Very Poor              | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there was no student who got very poor level, 1 student who got fair to poor level, 15 students who got good to average level, and 6 students who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test none of the students who got very poor level and fair to poor level, 14 students who got good to average level, and 8 students who got

excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 15 at the score of good to average level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 14 at the score of good to average level. The total frequency was 22.

#### 4) Language Use

**Table IV. 15**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Language Use of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 22-25              | Excellent to Very Good | -           | -           | 3           | 13.636      |
| 18-21              | Good to Average        | 11          | 50          | 15          | 68.182      |
| 17-11              | Fair to Poor           | 11          | 50          | 4           | 18.182      |
| 10-5               | Very Poor              | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there was no student who got very poor level, 11 students who got fair to poor level, 11 students who got good to average level, and there was no student who got excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test none of the students who got very poor level, 4 students who got fair to poor level, 15 students who got good to average level, and 3 students who got excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 11 both at the score of fair to poor level and good to average level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 15 at the score of good to average level. The total frequency was 22.

## 5) Mechanics

**Table IV. 16**  
**The Distribution of Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test**  
**on Mechanics of Writing**

| Score Range        | Criteria               | Pre-test    |             | Post-test   |             |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    |                        | F           | P (%)       | F           | P (%)       |
| 5                  | Excellent to Very Good | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| 4                  | Good to Average        | 12          | 54.545      | 12          | 54.545      |
| 3                  | Fair to Poor           | 7           | 31.818      | 10          | 45.455      |
| 2                  | Very Poor              | 3           | 13.636      | -           | -           |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                        | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>N=22</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there was 3 students who got very poor level, 7 students who got fair to poor level, 12 students who got good to average level, and no excellent to very good level in pre-test. While in post-test none of the students got very poor level, 10 students got fair to poor level, 12 students got good to average level, and also no excellent to very good level. The highest frequency of pre-test in this case was 12 at the score of good to average level. And the highest frequency of post-test in this case was 12 at the score of good to average level. The total frequency was 22.

### C. The Data Presentation of Using SRSD toward the Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph

The following is the table of description of pre-test and post-test of experimental class and control class.

**Table IV. 17**  
**The Recapitulation of Students' Pre-test and Post-test**

| NUMBER         | EXPERIMENTAL CLASS |                    |               | CONTROL CLASS     |                    |              |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
|                | SCORE OF PRE-TEST  | SCORE OF POST-TEST | GAIN SCORE    | SCORE OF PRE-TEST | SCORE OF POST-TEST | GAIN SCORE   |
| 1              | 71.5               | 80.5               | 9             | 76                | 82                 | 6            |
| 2              | 69                 | 83                 | 14            | 80.5              | 75                 | -5.5         |
| 3              | 76.5               | 78                 | 1.5           | 60.5              | 73                 | 12.5         |
| 4              | 75.5               | 86                 | 10.5          | 70.5              | 80                 | 9.5          |
| 5              | 81                 | 83.5               | 2.5           | 72.5              | 79.5               | 7            |
| 6              | 67.5               | 83                 | 15.5          | 63                | 73.5               | 10.5         |
| 7              | 67                 | 85.5               | 18.5          | 69                | 74.5               | 5.5          |
| 8              | 74                 | 90                 | 16            | 74                | 78                 | 4            |
| 9              | 69                 | 77.5               | 8.5           | 77                | 80.5               | 3.5          |
| 10             | 77                 | 84                 | 7             | 74                | 76.5               | 2.5          |
| 11             | 78                 | 85                 | 7             | 72                | 75                 | 3            |
| 12             | 76.5               | 90                 | 13.5          | 70.5              | 77                 | 6.5          |
| 13             | 64.5               | 82.5               | 18            | 70                | 75.5               | 5.5          |
| 14             | 70.5               | 83                 | 12.5          | 83.5              | 82.5               | -1           |
| 15             | 80.5               | 79.5               | -1            | 65                | 74                 | 9            |
| 16             | 73.5               | 79.5               | 6             | 80                | 77                 | -3           |
| 17             | 71.5               | 78.5               | 7             | 60                | 74                 | 14           |
| 18             | 66                 | 75.5               | 9.5           | 71                | 74                 | 3            |
| 19             | 71                 | 88                 | 17            | 75                | 77                 | 2            |
| 20             | 69.5               | 77.5               | 8             | 78                | 90                 | 12           |
| 21             | 75                 | 85                 | 10            | 70.5              | 84.5               | 14           |
| 22             | 67                 | 83                 | 16            | 77                | 79                 | 2            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b>1591.5</b>      | <b>1818</b>        | <b>226.5</b>  | <b>1589.5</b>     | <b>1712</b>        | <b>122.5</b> |
| <b>AVERAGE</b> | <b>72.341</b>      | <b>82.636</b>      | <b>10.295</b> | <b>72.25</b>      | <b>77.818</b>      | <b>5.568</b> |

It can be seen from the table that there is actually significant difference between pre-test and post-test in experimental class and control class. It can be seen from the difference of the gain as well.



## D. The Data Analysis

### 1. The Data Analysis of Using SRSD

The Data Analysis of using SRSD was based on the percentage of the observation list. The writer had fully implemented the SRSD to the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru. This can be seen in the total percentage of using SRSD.

### 2. The Data Analysis of Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph

#### a. Writing Ability in Narrative Paragraph with SRSD

The Data of the students' pre-test and post-test were obtained from the result of their writing narrative paragraph.

#### b. Significant Difference on Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph between those who Use SRSD and those who do not

To know whether there is or not a significant difference from the two terms, writer used the formula of *T-test* to analyze the difference of means.

$$t_o = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right]^2}}$$

Where:

$t_o$  = The value of t-obtained

$M_x$  = The mean score of experimental class

$M_y$  = The mean score of control class

$SD_x$  = Standard deviation of experimental class

$SD_y$  = Standard deviation of control class

$N$  = The number of student

The following is the table of the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph both in experimental and control class.

**Table IV. 18**  
**The Percentage of Students' Writing from Pre-test to Post-test**

| No           | Experimental Class |                    |               |                | Control Class     |                    |              |                |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------|
|              | Score of Pre-test  | Score of Post-test | Range         | P(%)           | Score of Pre-test | Score of Post-test | Range        | P(%)           |
| 1            | 71.5               | 80.5               | 9             | 12.59          | 76                | 82                 | 6            | 7.89           |
| 2            | 69                 | 83                 | 14            | 20.29          | 80.5              | 75                 | -5.5         | -6.83          |
| 3            | 76.5               | 78                 | 1.5           | 1.96           | 60.5              | 73                 | 12.5         | 20.66          |
| 4            | 75.5               | 86                 | 10.5          | 13.91          | 70.5              | 80                 | 9.5          | 13.48          |
| 5            | 81                 | 83.5               | 2.5           | 3.09           | 72.5              | 79.5               | 7            | 9.66           |
| 6            | 67.5               | 83                 | 15.5          | 22.96          | 63                | 73.5               | 10.5         | 16.67          |
| 7            | 67                 | 85.5               | 18.5          | 27.61          | 69                | 74.5               | 5.5          | 7.97           |
| 8            | 74                 | 90                 | 16            | 21.62          | 74                | 78                 | 4            | 5.41           |
| 9            | 69                 | 77.5               | 8.5           | 12.32          | 77                | 80.5               | 3.5          | 4.55           |
| 10           | 77                 | 84                 | 7             | 9.09           | 74                | 76.5               | 2.5          | 3.38           |
| 11           | 78                 | 85                 | 7             | 8.97           | 72                | 75                 | 3            | 4.17           |
| 12           | 76.5               | 90                 | 13.5          | 17.65          | 70.5              | 77                 | 6.5          | 9.22           |
| 13           | 64.5               | 82.5               | 18            | 27.91          | 70                | 75.5               | 5.5          | 7.86           |
| 14           | 70.5               | 83                 | 12.5          | 17.73          | 83.5              | 82.5               | -1           | -1.20          |
| 15           | 80.5               | 79.5               | -1            | -1.24          | 65                | 74                 | 9            | 13.85          |
| 16           | 73.5               | 79.5               | 6             | 8.16           | 80                | 77                 | -3           | -3.75          |
| 17           | 71.5               | 78.5               | 7             | 9.79           | 60                | 74                 | 14           | 23.33          |
| 18           | 66                 | 75.5               | 9.5           | 14.39          | 71                | 74                 | 3            | 4.23           |
| 19           | 71                 | 88                 | 17            | 23.94          | 75                | 77                 | 2            | 2.67           |
| 20           | 69.5               | 77.5               | 8             | 11.51          | 78                | 90                 | 12           | 15.38          |
| 21           | 75                 | 85                 | 10            | 13.33          | 70.5              | 84.5               | 14           | 19.86          |
| 22           | 67                 | 83                 | 16            | 23.88          | 77                | 79                 | 2            | 2.60           |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>1591.5</b>      | <b>1818</b>        | <b>226.5</b>  | <b>321.470</b> | <b>1589.5</b>     | <b>1712</b>        | <b>122.5</b> | <b>181.029</b> |
| <b>MEAN</b>  | <b>72.341</b>      | <b>82.636</b>      | <b>10.295</b> | <b>14.612</b>  | <b>72.250</b>     | <b>77.818</b>      | <b>5.568</b> | <b>8.229</b>   |

It is clear that the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph of experimental class is higher than the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph of control class. It is shown by the calculation of mean of range, and also the mean of percentage is higher as well.

The following is the table of mean and standard deviation of range score of experimental class and control class.

**Table IV. 19**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of Score for Experimental Class and Control Class**

| STUDENTS     | SCORE         |              | X (X-MX) | Y (Y-MY) | X <sup>2</sup> | Y <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------------|----------------|
|              | X             | Y            |          |          |                |                |
| 1            | 9             | 6            | -1.3     | 0.43     | 1.68           | 0.19           |
| 2            | 14            | -5.5         | 3.7      | -11.07   | 13.72          | 122.5          |
| 3            | 1.5           | 12.5         | -8.8     | 6.93     | 77.36          | 48.05          |
| 4            | 10.5          | 9.5          | 0.2      | 3.93     | 0.04           | 15.46          |
| 5            | 2.5           | 7            | -7.8     | 1.43     | 60.77          | 2.05           |
| 6            | 15.5          | 10.5         | 5.2      | 4.93     | 27.09          | 24.32          |
| 7            | 18.5          | 5.5          | 8.2      | -0.07    | 67.31          | 0              |
| 8            | 16            | 4            | 5.7      | -1.57    | 32.54          | 2.46           |
| 9            | 8.5           | 3.5          | -1.8     | -2.07    | 3.22           | 4.28           |
| 10           | 7             | 2.5          | -3.3     | -3.07    | 10.86          | 9.41           |
| 11           | 7             | 3            | -3.3     | -2.57    | 10.86          | 6.6            |
| 12           | 13.5          | 6.5          | 3.2      | 0.93     | 10.27          | 0.87           |
| 13           | 18            | 5.5          | 7.7      | -0.07    | 59.36          | 0              |
| 14           | 12.5          | -1           | 2.2      | -6.57    | 4.86           | 43.14          |
| 15           | -1            | 9            | -11.3    | 3.43     | 127.59         | 11.78          |
| 16           | 6             | -3           | -4.3     | -8.57    | 18.45          | 73.41          |
| 17           | 7             | 14           | -3.3     | 8.43     | 10.86          | 71.1           |
| 18           | 9.5           | 3            | -0.8     | -2.57    | 0.63           | 6.6            |
| 19           | 17            | 2            | 6.7      | -3.57    | 44.95          | 12.73          |
| 20           | 8             | 12           | -2.3     | 6.43     | 5.27           | 41.37          |
| 21           | 10            | 14           | -0.3     | 8.43     | 0.09           | 71.1           |
| 22           | 16            | 2            | 5.7      | -3.57    | 32.54          | 12.73          |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>226.5</b>  | <b>122.5</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>620.33</b>  | <b>580.148</b> |
| <b>MEAN</b>  | <b>10.295</b> | <b>5.568</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>28.197</b>  | <b>24.816</b>  |

While the result of the standard deviation of writing narrative paragraph for each class as follows:

1) Experimental class

$$SD_x = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{620.330}{22}} = \sqrt{28.197} = 5.310$$

2) Control Class

$$SD_y = \sqrt{\frac{\sum y^2}{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{580.197}{22}} = \sqrt{26.370} = 5.135$$

So:

$$SD_x = 5.310$$

$$SD_y = 5.135$$

$$M_x = 10.295$$

$$M_y = 5.568$$

$$t_o = ?$$

$$t_o = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right]^2}} = \frac{10.295 - 5.568}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{5.310}{\sqrt{22-1}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{5.135}{\sqrt{22-1}}\right]^2}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{4.727}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{5.310}{\sqrt{21}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{5.135}{\sqrt{21}}\right]^2}} = \frac{4.727}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{5.310}{4.583}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{5.135}{4.583}\right]^2}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{4.727}{\sqrt{[1.159]^2 + [1.121]^2}} = \frac{4.727}{\sqrt{1.343 + 1.256}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{4.727}{\sqrt{2.598}} = \frac{4.727}{1.612} = 2.93$$

Based on the calculation above, it is clear that the obtained to is. To know whether there is or no significant difference of the ability in writing narrative paragraph between students who are taught by using SRSD and those who are taught by using conventional technique, it needs to obtain the degree of freedom by following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 df &= (N1 + N2) - 2 \\
 &= (22 + 22) - 2 \\
 &= (44) - 2 \\
 &= 42
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, it can be said that the degree of freedom is 42. Because the degree of 42 is not available, the writer took 40 as the nearest score to 42. The *t-table* at 5% level of significance=2.02 and at 1% of significance=2.72. It can be clearly seen that  $t_o$  is higher than *t-table* both in 5% and 1% level of significance. And it can be concluded that  $2.02 < 2.93 > 2.72$ . Therefore, the first hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) that postulates significant difference of ability in writing narrative paragraph between students who are taught by using SRSD and those who are taught by using conventional (drafting) technique is accepted and automatically the second hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) is rejected. It means “there is a significant difference between using and without using SRSD to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru.”

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

#### **A. Conclusion**

Finally, the research about the effect of using SRSD toward the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru comes to the conclusion as follows:

1. The ability of the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru in writing narrative paragraph that are taught by using SRSD is categorized into very good level.
2. The ability of the second year students of Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru in writing narrative paragraph that are taught by using drafting technique is categorized into good level.
3. From analysis of t-test, it can be seen that  $t_o$  is bigger than t-table. In conclusion,  $H_o$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted, and it means "there is a significant difference between using and without using SRSD to increase the ability in writing narrative paragraph of the second year students at Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru."

#### **B. Suggestion**

Based on the research findings, the writer would like to give some suggestions to create the better process of teaching and learning, especially to the teacher and to the school.

From the conclusion of the research above, it is known that using SRSD can give significant effect toward the students' ability in writing narrative paragraph. Because of that, SRSD can be one of the choices for the English teacher in order to increase students' ability in writing narrative paragraph. Therefore, English teacher should know how to teach writing by using SRSD.

Besides, teacher should also use many ways to encourage students in writing narrative paragraph like:

- a. Teachers should construct creative and enjoyable learning for students.
- b. Teachers should support their techniques by using interesting media.
- c. Teachers can encourage the students' awareness about the importance of writing for their life.
- d. Teacher makes writing as habitual activities for students in the school.

In addition, Junior High School Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru should have some English activities especially for English lesson such English Day, English Club and publishing article or poems in the bulletin board, because those programs are really helpful for the students to study English.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Artono W., et. al. (2008). *English in Focus for Grade VIII Junior High School (SMP/MTs)*. Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. Retrieved on December 11<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Boardman, C. A. (2002). *Writing to Communicate (Paragraph and Essay)*. New York: Longman.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Inc.
- Gorys K. (2001). *Argumentasi dan Narasi*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing Next, Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools*. New York: Carnegie Corporation. Retrieved on May 22<sup>nd</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Harmer, J. (2005). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Cambridge UK: Longman. Retrieved on May 25<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Harris, K. R., et. al. (2009). *Handbook of Metacognition in Education, Metacognition and Children's Writing*. ed. Douglas J. Hacker, et al. New York: Madison Ave. Retrieved on May 25<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Harris, K. R., et. al. (2010). *Metacognition and Strategies Instruction in Writing, Metacognition, Strategy Use, and Instruction*. ed. Harriet Salatas Waters & Wolfgang Schneider. New York: The Guilford Press. Retrieved on December 20<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Hartono, (2004). *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Holladay, S. A., & Brown, T. L. (1981). *Options in Rhetoric Writing and Reading*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Hughey, J. B., et al. (1983). *Teaching ESL Composition: Principles and Techniques*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Kane, T. S. (2000). *The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. New York: Barkley Books. Retrieved on January 8<sup>th</sup> 2012 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Kelly, A.V. (2004). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice*. (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: SAGE Publications. Retrieved on December 20<sup>th</sup> 2012 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).



- Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, Text, Grammar, Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press. Retrieved on January 14<sup>th</sup> 2012 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- M. Kalayo H., & M. Fauzan A. (2007). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: UNRI Press.
- M. Syafi'i S. (2007). *The Effective Paragraph Development: The Process of Writing for Classroom Setting*. Pekanbaru: LBSI.
- Meyers, A. (2005). *Gateways to Academic Writing: Effective Sentences Paragraph and Essay*. New York: Longman.
- Nadia D. (2008). *The Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph and the Factor that Influence It*. Pekanbaru: Unpublished Undergraduated Thesis of UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Pinto, M. D. (2005). *Looking at Reading and Writing through Language, Effective Learning and Teaching of Writing: A Handbook of Writing in Education*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Vol. 14. GertRijlaarsdam, et al. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Regan, K., & Mastropieri, M. A. (2009). *Current Practice Alerts: a Focus on Self Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) for Writing*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Division for Learning Disabilities and the Division for Research. Retrieved on December 20<sup>th</sup> 2012 from [teachingld.org](http://teachingld.org).
- Reid, R., & Lienemann, T. O. (2006). *Strategy Instruction for Students with Learning Disabilities, What Works for Special-Needs Learners*. ed. Karen R. H. & Steve G. New York: The Guilford Press. Retrieved on October 1<sup>st</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. A Description and Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved on May 25<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Richards, J. C., et al. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Pearson Education limited.
- Sandmel, K. (2010). *"I am a Raindrop!" Narrative Writing Strategies and Self-Regulated Strategy Development for Fourth and Fifth Grade Students with Writing and Behavioral Difficulties*. Nashville, Tennessee: Graduate School of Vanderbilt University. Retrieved on February 20<sup>th</sup> 2013 from [http://etd.library.vanderbilt.edu/available/etd-07212010-40129/unrestricted/Sandmel\\_Dissertation.pdf](http://etd.library.vanderbilt.edu/available/etd-07212010-40129/unrestricted/Sandmel_Dissertation.pdf).

- Sandmel, K., et al. (2011). *Success and Failure with Tier-2 SRSD for Timed-Writing Tests among Second through Fifth-Grade Students with Writing and Behavioral Difficulties Implications for Evidence-Based Practice, Advances in Learning and Behavioral Disabilities. Volume 24, Assessment and Intervention*. ed. Thomas E. Scruggs & Margo A. Mastropieri Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Retrieved on December 20<sup>th</sup> 2011 from [www.library.nu](http://www.library.nu).
- Sari N. (2010). *Improving the Students' Ability in Writing Expository Paragraph through Self-Regulated Strategy Development at STAI Rakha Amuntai-South Kalimantan*. Malang: Unpublished Thesis of English Language Education, Graduate Program of State University of Malang. Retrieved on February 20<sup>th</sup> 2013 from <http://library.um.ac.id/free-contents/index.php/pub/detail/improving-the-students-ability-in-writing-expository-paragraph-through-self-regulated-strategy-development-at-atai-rakha-amuntai-south-kalimantan-ninaya-sari-45766.html>.
- SMP Al-Ishlah Pekanbaru. (2010). *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*. Pekanbaru: SMP Al-Ishlah.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2010). *Syllabus of English*. Pekanbaru: SMP Al-Ishlah.
- Suharsimi A. (2009). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Sulasmu K. (2007). *An Experiment on the Effectiveness of Using Brainstorming Technique in Increasing Students' Writing Ability at the Second Year of English Education Department State Islamic University of Suska Riau*. Pekanbaru: UIN Suska.
- Yusak M. (2004). *A Brief Introduction to Genre*. Jawa Tengah: LPMP.